



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A 872,579

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

83147

THIRD SERIES.

150

VOL. XVII.

JANUARY—APRIL.

MDCCLXXXVII.

LONDON: BURNS & OATES, LIMITED.

DUBLIN: M. H. GILL & SON.

NEW YORK: CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY CO.
9, BARCLAY STREET.

1887.

AP

4

D82



and also cannot rely on her foreign policy as a safeguard of national existence—Mr. Gallenga's bitterness against Leo XIII.—He has to acknowledge Italy's growing demoralization—Hope for the future is elsewhere than where Mr. Gallenga looks.

ART. VIII.—LIGHTFOOT'S ST. IGNATIUS AND THE ROMAN PRIMACY 380

Insignificant amount of Apostolic remains : the advantage and loss—Value of Bishop Lightfoot's edition of St. Ignatius ; the story of the various Codices—The genuineness of the Epistles—Their personal interest, and the picture of the Saint : no Saint of later times more specially devoted to the Sacred Humanity—His belief in the Real Presence—He is the great doctor of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy—Dr. Lightfoot's admissions as to the Episcopate—St. Ignatius on the Unity of the Church ; Dr. Lightfoot admits that he assigns a primacy of rank to the Church of Rome—Recently discovered early testimony to primacy of Roman Pontiff—A reply to Dr. Lightfoot's distinction between the Bishop and the Church of Rome : "the later Roman theory" traceable back at least as far as the middle of the second century.

ART. IX.—THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY 400

The story of its beginnings—The absence of paid labour in it—The scheme of promulgating Catholic literature not of recent date : old Catholic Defence and other Societies—Elements of success in the Truth Society : its objects—Need it has of support from the Laity : hoped-for results.

NOTES OF TRAVEL AND EXPLORATION 414

Persian Life and Manners—Commercial Resources of Persia—The far North-West—Kamschatkan Volcanoes—Scenery of Formosa—British North Borneo—General Prjevalsky on Central Asia—Russian Influence in China—Discontent with Chinese Rule—English Travellers in Afghanistan—The Hazra Country—Afghan Turkestan—New Soudan Expedition.

NOTES ON NOVELS 420

She—In the Clouds—A Son of Hagar—Jess—Spring-haven—Lazarus in London—The Story of an African Farm—Dawn.

NOTICES OF CATHOLIC CONTINENTAL PERIODICALS 424

Revue des Questions Historiques—Katholik—Stimmen aus Maria Laach—Historisch-politisch Blätter—La Civiltà Cattolica.

	PAGE
NOTES ON NOVELS	197
<p>The Princess Casamassima—The Old Order Changes—A Modern Telemachus—Lady Branksmere—A Northern Lily—Neæra—Sir Percival—For the Old Land.</p>	
NOTICES OF CATHOLIC CONTINENTAL PERIODICALS	202
<p>La Controverse—Stimmen aus Maria Laach—Historisch- politische Blätter—Historisches Jahrbuch—Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie—Civiltà Cattolica.</p>	
NOTICES OF BOOKS	211
<p>Mr. Healy Thompson's Life of Père Muard—Cardinal Allen's Souls Departed—Rev. M. Canty's Purgatory —History of St. Margaret's, Edinburgh—Father Guy's Synods in English—Dr. Philip Sweeny's Controversial Letters—Father Humphrey's Bible and Belief, Spouses of the King, and Christian Marriage—Dr. Hüffer's St. Bernard—Bishop of Newport's Christian Priesthood— Hurter's Nomenclator Literarius—Ceremoniale Episco- porum—Annales Minorum—St. Augustine—Dr. Cun- ningham's St. Austin — Dr. P. Schaff's Augustine, Melancthon, and Neander—Dr. Travers Smith's Man's Knowledge of God and Man—Costa Rosetti's Philosophia Moralis—Tornatore's Expositio and De Humana Cog- nitione—Dr. Allegre on Matrimonial Impediments— Lehmkuhl's Theology—Father Ehrle's Works of Aris- totle—Regestum Clementis V.—Thayer's Edition of Grimm's N.T. Lexicon—Fabiola, Illustrated—Gneist's English Parliament—Pictorial Bible—De Courcy's Coalition de 1701—The Catholic Directory, 1887— Miss Atteridge's Foremost if I can.</p>	
BOOKS OF DEVOTION AND SPIRITUAL READING	239
<p>RECORD OF ROMAN DOCUMENTS (<i>at the end</i>).</p>	

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
ART. I.—CHURCH EXTENSION AND ANGLICAN EXPANSION . . .	243
What "Extension" or "Expansion" meant in early times and still means among Catholics—The Rev. Sir G. W. Cox's idea of "expansion" of the Church of England is that it may embrace all sects: his proposal to do away with tests and the Act of Uniformity—A proposal, which Dr. Martineau seconded for other reasons: his theory: he mistakes mysticism for religion: mysticism everywhere, and compatible with immorality—Had this proposed system of toleration meant "expansion" to our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, the results would have been fatal to the English people: example of Ireland: the influence of women—Many besides Catholics would admit the desirability of one religion prevailing, but cannot see that that one is the Catholic—The evidential value of miracles, which <i>have</i> occurred in the Catholic communion: why they do not occur nowadays out of it—A selection of miracles from various periods of the Church.	
ART. II.—BARBOUR'S LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS.	265
Value of recent discovery of Barbour's writings: his life—Character of the Legends: reason for selecting the legend of St. Machar as an illustration—The legend of St. Machar; his connection with St. Columba; becomes the Apostle of Aberdeenshire; he goes with St. Columba to Rome; the Pope changes his name; on the return journey he stays, and eventually dies at Tours.	
ART. III.—WAR AND BALLOONING	278
Early theories and attempted construction of balloons: partial successes of Cavallo, the Montgolfiers, and Charles the Parisian—The use of balloons as an adjunct to war—Recent revival of captive balloons by English Government—Free balloons during siege of Paris—Attempts at balloon navigation: (1) by using the air currents, (2) by methods of mechanical propulsion—The "Flotteur Frein" and probable utilization of air routes—Mr. Bruce's own electrical signalling balloon.	

ART. IV.—CRITICS AND CLASS-LISTS	PAGE 287
The natural tendency to compare and classify; its advantages and dangers—A special danger in criticism of imaginative works, and especially of poetry—The three greatest poets according to Mr. M. Arnold, Mr. A. Austin, and Mr. Swinburne; how far their preferences are due or amenable to reasoning—Lesson suggested by their difference of views: the non-reasonable element in poetry—The untranslatableableness of the best poetry—The music of poetry does not distinguish it from prose, yet essential to its total effect—The work of the critics: Mr. Swinburne's criticisms.	
ART. V.—THE CHURCH AFTER THE CONQUEST	306
Eadmer's honesty; his information about the Church after the Conquest makes one wonder that the Reformation did not come before Henry VIII.—A sketch of things in England—Usurpation of ecclesiastical rights and of Papal privileges by the King—Lanfranc, his character and doings: the Norman Bishops; the Monks; Odo—England in schism—The Conqueror makes his secular Court sovereign in spiritual matters: he lays the egg which Henry VIII. hatches: Lanfranc and suffragans accept the Reformation in principle—The Conqueror's succession; Henry and St. Anselm; usurpation of rights by Henry II.—Growing dislike of the Holy See, and constant warfare against him: the fruits thereof.	
ART. VI.—WHERE ST. PATRICK WAS BORN	334
Recently advanced theories render it opportune to restate the old Irish and Scotch belief that the Saint was born near Dumbarton, at Old Kilpatrick—A catena of the original authorities—Two conclusions from this evidence: (1) that St. Patrick was born in Britain, (2) and at or near Dumbarton—Father Morris's arguments for France—Father Malone's contention for Bath: his proofs refuted; his opinion merely a theory—The value of the old Catholic tradition.	
ART. VII.—ITALY PRESENT AND FUTURE	359
Mr. Gallenga's first work on Italy in 1841 and his present book; he cannot yet be sanguine except for the distant future—The military position and strength of Italy; not possible to be sanguine about the future of the army—Her iron-clad fleet; the men untried—Her financial and economic weakness; over-taxation, and cruel suffering, amongst the lower classes—Swarms of needy officials, and sinecure appointments—Italy has gained little by robbing the Church.—Italy is without internal strength,	

and also cannot rely on her foreign policy as a safeguard of national existence—Mr. Gallenga's bitterness against Leo XIII.—He has to acknowledge Italy's growing demoralisation—Hope for the future is elsewhere than where Mr. Gallenga looks.

ART. VIII.—LIGHTFOOT'S ST. IGNATIUS AND THE ROMAN PRIMACY 380

Insignificant amount of Apostolic remains: the advantage and loss—Value of Bishop Lightfoot's edition of St. Ignatius; the story of the various Codices—The genuineness of the Epistles—Their personal interest, and the picture of the Saint: no Saint of later times more specially devoted to the Sacred Humanity—His belief in the Real Presence—He is the great doctor of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy—Dr. Lightfoot's admissions as to the Episcopate—St. Ignatius on the Unity of the Church; Dr. Lightfoot admits that he assigns a primacy of rank to the Church of Rome—Recently discovered early testimony to primacy of Roman Pontiff—A reply to Dr. Lightfoot's distinction between the Bishop and the Church of Rome: "the later Roman theory" traceable back at least as far as the middle of the second century.

ART. IX.—THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY 400

The story of its beginnings—The absence of paid labour in it—The scheme of promulgating Catholic literature not of recent date: old Catholic Defences and other Societies—Elements of success in the Truth Society: its objects—Need it has of support from the Laity: hoped-for results.

NOTES OF TRAVEL AND EXPLORATION 414

Persian Life and Manners—Commercial Resources of Persia—The far North-West—Kamschatkan Volcanoes—Scenery of Formosa—British North Borneo—General Przhevalsky on Central Asia—Russian Influence in China—Discontent with Chinese Rule—English Travellers in Afghanistan—The Hazra Country—Afghan Turkestan—New Sudan Expedition.

NOTES ON NOVELS 420

She—In the Clouds—A Son of Hagar—Jess—Spring-haven—Lazarus in London—The Story of an African Farm—Dawn.

NOTICES OF CATHOLIC CONTINENTAL PERIODICALS 424

Revue des Questions Historiques—Katholik—Stimmen aus Maria Laach—Historisch-politisch Blätter—La Civiltà Cattolica.

	PAGE
NOTICES OF BOOKS	430
Professor Creighton's History of the Papacy—Provost Consitt's Life of St. Cuthbert; Father Stevenson's Translation of V. Bede's St. Cuthbert—Father Sebas- tian Bowden's Translation of Hettinger's Dante—Life of Mother H. Kerr—J. A. Symonds' Catholic Reaction —Formby's Monotheism of Rome—J. H. Wylie's Eng- land under Henry IV.—Life of A. Rosmini—The Tournay Quarto Missal—Card. Hergenröther's Church History—Father J. Jungmann's <i>Æsthetik</i> —B. Jung- mann's Dissertations in Church History—French Translation of Janssen's Germany—Father Bridgett's Ritual of N.T.—The Religious Houses of United King- dom—The Catholic Year-book—C. F. B. Allnutt's Church and Sects—De Bonald's <i>Pensées</i> —Hazell's Cy- clopædia 1887—Charvériat's <i>Bohême au XVI. Siècle</i> — Some non-Catholic Scriptural Commentaries—Dr. Poole's Acts of the Apostles—Percy's <i>Revenge</i> —The Coiner's Cave—Thekla—The Miser of King's Court—Annunziata —J. Pym Yeatman's County of Derby—The <i>Cornhill</i> <i>Magazine</i> , 1886—The <i>English Illustrated Magazine</i> , 1886—Rev. J. P. Prendergast's Lecture on Catholic Ireland—Rev. H. C. Duke's King, Prophet, and Priest —Rev. E. L. Hicks' Henry Bazely—The Final Science —The Maynooth Catechism—P. de Witt's Invasion of Holland—Miss Stokes' Completion of Didron's Icono- graphy—Macleod's Banking—Littleton's Translation of Reusch's Nature and the Bible—Dr. Farrar's History of Interpretation—The Castle of Coëtquen—F. Harri- son's Choice of Books—Schürer's Jewish People—St. Paul and St. Mark's Gospel—Bishop Stubbs' Lectures— Doyle's Baronage of England—Hodgkin's Letters of Cassiodorus—Lenormant's Book of Genesis—Phillips' Our Administration of India—Two volumes of "Sacred Books of the East"—Future Probation: a Symposium —Ashton's Legendary History of the Cross—Cox's First Century of Christianity—Dr. J. Cunningham's Growth of the Church.	
BOOKS OF DEVOTION AND SPIRITUAL READING	488
RECORD OF ROMAN DOCUMENTS (<i>at the end</i>).	

THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1887.

ART. I.—MR. JOHN MORLEY.

Mr. John Morley's Writings. In Nine Volumes. A New Edition. London: Macmillan & Co.

I SUPPOSE we may take Mr. John Morley's new and uniform edition of his principal writings to be in some sort his farewell to literature as a profession. The occasion is suitable for considering him as a teacher. Mr. Morley is emphatically "a representative man"—one of the ablest types of a school of thought not, perhaps, numerically very considerable in England, but assuredly very considerable in other respects. The history of the world may be said, with some truth, to be the history of the triumphs of minorities who knew their own minds. Now, the party—or, to speak more accurately, the sect—of which Mr. Morley is a leader, unquestionably does know its own mind. As unquestionably in him they have an exponent of whom they may be justly proud. Even those whose religious convictions and whose political opinions are the furthest removed from his, must confess and admire the high gifts which, with no aid from family or fortune, have raised him to a seat in the Cabinet and a commanding position among party leaders. And no one who has intelligently studied his writings can for one moment confound him with the sort of men of whom party leaders are usually made. A very able journalist—the late Mr. Hannay—when some one accused Sir Robert Peel of having no principles, replied: "Oh yes, he has principles—as a horse-dealer has horses." The saying was monstrously unjust as regards that eminent man. But who can deny that it is only too applicable to a large and ever-increasing number of prominent politicians? There is the gravest reason to fear that at no distant date the designation of public man will be as little honourable as that

of public woman. "Est-ce qu'il n'est pas tout naturel que vos convictions tournent avec votre intérêt? Elles ne changent pas pour ça: elles se déplacent: voilà tout." So observes the clever American lady in "Rabagas." But Mr. Morley's convictions are of another order. They are held with an intensity of belief and an earnestness of purpose which breathe in every page of his writings. They are the very springs of his intellectual life. Nothing more honourably distinguishes him in an age of political Pyrrhonism than the depth and sincerity of the faith that is in him. I propose to inquire what that faith is. And I shall answer the inquiry, as far as possible, in his own words. My task will be little more than to tabulate from his writings his own account of his beliefs and aims. The necessity for doing this arises from the fact that Mr. Morley, with the one exception of his work on "Compromise," has not systematically or consecutively expounded his views. In an article in his "Miscellanies" * he observes how dexterous Robespierre used to be in presenting his case. "First, he said everything important at the exact moment, when he had brought the minds of his hearers into the state most fitted to receive it. Second, he insinuated gradually and indirectly into their minds ideas which would have aroused opposition if they had been expressed more directly." This is also Mr. Morley's favourite method. And he has pursued it with great skill and with abundance of success.

His plausible words
He scattered not in ears, but grafted them,
To grow there, and to bear.

He is well aware, as he has told us in his book on "Compromise," † that "it is not easy to wind an Englishman up to the level of dogma." But that is his avowed end. And he has displayed quite remarkable astuteness in his choice of means.

What, then, is the dogma which Mr. Morley has embraced, and which he desires to recommend to his countrymen? It is, in fact, the way of thinking about human life and its conditions which the French emphatically express by the words "The Revolution." Mr. Morley observes, very truly: "The greatest problem that ever dawns upon any human intelligence that has the privilege of discerning it, is the problem of a philosophy and a body of doctrine:" ‡ because that problem really embraces all other problems. He knows well—no one better—that the supreme issue of the present day is not merely political or social, but religious. "It has been justly said," he writes, "that at the bottom of all the great discussions of modern society lie

* Vol. i. p. 47.

† P. 6.

‡ "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 86.

the two momentous questions, whether there is a God, and whether the soul is immortal." * Now, the answer which Christianity gave to these questions was, until a century ago, generally received throughout Europe. Everywhere religion was publicly professed, and in it men found the main sanction of law, the great foundation both of the public and private order. "At the heart of the Revolution," as Mr. Morley tersely expresses it, "is a new way of understanding life." † He accepts the formula, "*Révolution, Révélation.*" In a passage worth presenting at some length he draws this out:

Christianity is the name for a great variety of changes which took place, during the first centuries of our era, in men's ways of thinking and feeling about their spiritual relations to unseen powers, about their moral relations to one another, about the basis and type of social union. So the Revolution is now the accepted name for a set of changes which began faintly to take a definite practical shape . . . towards the end of the eighteenth century. . . . While one movement supplied the energy and the principles which extricated civilization from the ruins of the Roman Empire, the other supplies . . . amid the distractions of the various representatives of an obsolete ordering, the only forces to be trusted, at once for multiplying the achievements of human intelligence stimulated by human sympathy, and for diffusing their beneficent results with an ampler hand and more far-scattering arm. Faith in a divine power, devout obedience to its supposed will, hope of ecstatic, unspeakable reward—these were the springs of the old movement. Undivided love of our fellows, steadfast faith in human nature, steadfast search after justice, firm aspiration towards improvement, and generous contentment in the hope that others may reap whatever reward may be—these are the springs of the new. There is no given set of practical maxims agreed to by all members of the revolutionary schools for achieving the work of release from the pressure of an antiquated social condition, any more than there is one set of doctrines and one kind of discipline accepted by all Protestants. Voltaire was a revolutionist in one sense, Diderot in another, and Rousseau in a third; just as in the practical order, Lafayette, Danton, Robespierre, represented three different aspirations and as many methods. ‡

The Revolution, he goes on to tell us, "emphatically belongs" to the "class of great religious and moral movements." § It is, in fact, for Mr. Morley, a new and a better Gospel, and he delights in decorating it with the terms consecrated by the usage of the old. Thus, in one place he speaks of the *Philosophes* of the last century as "our spiritual Fathers that begat us." || Elsewhere he styles Hume, Rousseau, Diderot, "the fathers of

* "Compromise," p. 128.

† *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 1.

‡ "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 4.

§ *Ibid.* p. 5.

|| *Ibid.*

the new Church," and Condorcet, Mirabeau, Robespierre, its "fiery apostles." * Robespierre is also pronounced to be "the great preacher of the Declaration of the Rights of Man;" † and the Encyclopædists are described as "a new order," ‡ "bound by the new vows of poverty, truth, and liberty," § and destined, happily, to replace the Society of Jesus. "The best men of the eighteenth century," Mr. Morley avers, were possessed by "a furious antipathy against the Church, its creeds, and its book;" || just as the best men of the first century had their spirits stirred within them when they saw fair cities wholly given to idolatry. He describes Catholicism a hundred years ago, in language which recalls St. Paul's account of the heathen world, as "a true Chimera, a Monster sodden in black corruption, with whom in the heart of a humane man there could be no terms." ¶ He is of opinion that "the Church was the most justly abhorred of all institutions." ** On the other hand, as St. Peter discerned in his disciples "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood," "called out of darkness into admirable light," so does Mr. Morley discern in Diderot and his allies "the great party of illumination," †† "a new priesthood," ‡‡ upon whose "lawful authority" he insists, attributing to them "more generous moral ideas and higher spirituality." §§ Does the astonished reader stare and gasp at seeing "moral ideas" and "spirituality" ascribed to bestial materialists like Diderot and his crew? Let him possess his soul in peace awhile. We shall see by-and-by that Mr. Morley uses the words "spirituality" and "morality" in a new sense. Pass we on to observe that Mr. Morley considers the aspiration of the gluttonous and obscene blasphemers, who assembled round the Baron d'Holbach's table, for the destruction of "not merely the superstitions which had gathered round the Christian dogma, but every root and fragment of theistic conception," to be "a not ungenerous hope." |||| And his chief complaint against the men of the First Revolution is, that their means to this end were not well chosen, but "led to a mischievous reaction in favour of Catholicism." ¶¶ But I must quote Mr. Morley at length on this subject, for so alone can justice be done to the vigour of his thought and the charm of his manner. On the 10th of November 1793—or, out of compliment to Mr. Morley,

* "Miscellanies," vol. ii. p. 42.

† "Diderot," vol. i. p. 17.

|| "Miscellanies," vol. ii. p. 12.

** "Miscellanies," vol. ii. p. 172.

†† *Ibid.* p. 129. §§ *Ibid.* p. 131.

‡‡ *Ibid.* p. 129. §§ *Ibid.* p. 131.

¶¶ Diderot, vol. ii. p. 165. At p. 187 of the same volume he expresses the opinion that "the smoke of the flaming châteaux went up as a savoury and righteous sacrifice to heaven."

† *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 48.

§ *Ibid.* p. 125.

¶ "Voltaire," p. 224.

†† "Diderot," vol. i. p. 9.

||| "Rousseau," vol. ii. p. 256.

let us give the date of the revolutionary calendar, the 21st of Brumaire, year II.—took place in the cathedral of Notre Dame the famous Feast of the Goddess of Reason, ordained by the Commune of Paris at the instance of Chaumette. It is hardly necessary for me to recall the details of the function : how a well-known prostitute, Mdle. Candeille, “ of the Opera,” presented the goddess, and was exhibited on a cloud made of pasteboard, with a pike in her hand, and the sacred red nightcap on her head—it was almost her only clothing—as the living image of the new divinity ; how a lamp, representing Truth, burned before her ; how her breechesless adorers (*les sans-culottes*) sang in her honour a hymn written by Chenier, to a tune composed by one Gossec, a musician much in vogue then ; how they proceeded subsequently to celebrate mysteries, “ seemingly of a Cabiric or even Paphian character,” writes the historian, which, following his prudent example, I will “leave under the veil.” I need not say that Chaumette and his friends of the Commune—worthy predecessors of the present municipal rulers of Paris—did not confine themselves to thus persuasively recommending “the more generous moral ideas and higher spirituality” of the new faith. They also vigorously resorted to the civil sword. And now let us hear Mr. Morley upon them :

In the winter of 1793 the Municipal party, guided by Hébert and Chaumette, made their memorable attempt to extirpate Christianity in France. The doctrine of D'Holbach's supper-table had for a short space the arm of flesh and the sword of the temporal power on its side. It was the first appearance of dogmatic atheism in Europe as a political force. This makes it one of the most remarkable moments in the Revolution, just as it makes the Revolution itself the most remarkable moment in modern history. The first political demonstration of atheism was attended by some of the excesses, the folly, the extravagances that stained the growth of Christianity. On the whole, it is a very mild story compared with the atrocities of the Jewish records or the crimes of Catholicism. The worst charge against the party of Chaumette is, that they were intolerant, and the charge is deplorably true ; but this charge cannot lie in the mouth of persecuting churches. Historical recriminations, however, are not very edifying. . . . Let us raise ourselves into clearer air. The fault of the atheists is, that they knew no better than to borrow the maxims of the Churchmen ; and even those who agree with the dogmatic denials of the atheists—if such there be—ought yet to admit that the mere change from superstition to reason is a small gain, if the conclusions of reason are still to be enforced by the instruments of superstition. Our opinions are less important than the spirit and temper with which they possess us, and even good opinions are worth very little unless we hold them in a broad, intelligent, and spacious way. Now, some of the opinions of Chaumette

were full of enlightenment and hope. He had a generous and vivid faith in humanity. . . . One can understand how an honest man would abhor the darkness and tyranny of the Church. But then, to borrow the same absolutism in the interests of new light, was inevitably to bring the new light into the same abhorrence as had befallen the old system of darkness. . . . Instead of defying the Church by the theatrical march of the Goddess of Reason under the great sombre arches of the cathedral of Our Lady, Chaumette should have found comfort in a firm calculation of the conditions.

You, he might have said to the priests—you have so debilitated the minds of men and women by your promises and your dreams, that many a generation must come and go before Europe can throw off the yoke of your superstition. But we promise you that they shall be generations of strenuous battle. We give you all the advantage that you can get from the sincerity and pious worth of the good and simple among you. We give you all that the bad among you may get by resort to the poisoned weapons of your profession and your traditions—its bribes to mental indolence, its hypocritical affectations in the pulpit, its tyranny in the closet, its false speciousness in the world, its menace at the deathbed. With all these you may do your worst, and still humanity will escape you; still the conscience of the race will rise away from you, still the growth of brighter ideals and a nobler purpose will go on, leaving ever further and further behind them your dwarfed finality and leaden, moveless stereotype. We shall pass you by on your flank, your fieriest darts will only spend themselves upon air. We will not attack you as Voltaire did. We will not exterminate you; we shall explain you. History will place your dogma in its class, above or below a hundred competing dogmas, exactly as the naturalist classifies his species. From being a conviction, it will sink to a curiosity; from being a guide to millions of human lives, it will dwindle down to a chapter in a book. As history explains your dogma, so science will dry it up; the conception of law will silently make the conception of the daily miracle of your altars seem impossible; the mental climate will gradually deprive your symbols of your nourishment, and men will turn their backs upon your system, not because they confuted it, but because, like witchcraft or astrology, it has ceased to interest them. The great ship of your Church, once so stout and fair, and well laden with good destinies, is become a skeleton ship; it is a phantom hulk, with warped planks and sere canvas, and you who work it are no more than the ghosts of dead men, and at the hour when you seem to have reached the bay, down your ship will sink, like lead or like stone, to the deepest bottom.*

This passage affords an admirable specimen of Mr. Morley's controversial method. It will be observed that he is "replete with mocks, full of comparisons and wounding flouts" as Voltaire

* "Miscellanies," vol. i. p. 77.

himself. I shall give a few more samples of his skill in this art of "sapping a solemn creed with solemn sneer."

First, take the following, in which a parallel is more than hinted at between Voltaire and the Divine Founder of Christianity:—"Voltaire had no calm breadth of wisdom. It may be so. There are movements which need, not this calm breadth of wisdom, but a two-edged sword; and when the deliverers of mankind are those who come to send fire on the earth."*

Mr. Morley, to whose intimate acquaintance with the letter of the Sacred Scriptures every page of his writings bears witness, must be well aware who it was that said, "I have come to send fire upon the earth."

Again, complaining of the prominence given to the base and contemptible squabbles which fill so large a space in Voltaire's life, he asks: "Why, after all, should men, from Moses downwards, be so cheerfully ready to contemplate the hinder parts of their divinities?"†

Once more. In his brief and garbled account of the Voltaire-Hirsch lawsuit—"nowhere in the annals of jurisprudence is there a more despicable thing," Mr. Carlyle rightly judges‡—Mr. Morley is obliged to own that his spiritual father proved himself an accomplished forger and a hardy perjurer. But he finds in the Apostolic College of the old faith a precedent at least for the perjury, which thus, under his skilful manipulation, becomes one of "the signs of an apostle": "When very hard pressed, Voltaire would not swerve from a false oath any more than his great enemy the Apostle Peter had done."§

In an article in his "Miscellanies" Mr. Morley quotes M. Taine's opinion—which is the opinion of every sane thinker—that Jean-Jacques' "Contrat Social" "is very poor stuff." By way of reply, Mr. Morley observes that the Epistles and Gospels of Christianity are very poor stuff too. Here is the passage:

M. Taine shows, as so many others have shown before him, that the "Social Contract," when held up in the light of true political science, is very poor stuff. Undoubtedly it is so. And Quintilian—an accomplished and ingenious Taine of the first century—would have thought the Gospels and Epistles and Augustine and Jerome and Chrysostom very poor stuff indeed, compared with the

Mellifluous streams that watered all the schools
' Of Academics, old and new, with those
Surnamed Peripatetics, and the sect
Epicurean, and the Stoic severe.

* "Voltaire," p. 43.

† *Ibid.* p. 101.

‡ See his "Friedrich," book xvi. c. 7, for a full and impartial account of it.

§ "Voltaire," p. 206.

And in some ways, from a literary or logical point of view, the early Christian writers could ill bear this comparison.*

Is it possible to throw dust in the eyes of the confiding reader with a more engaging air of philosophic moderation?

In the same vein, in his book on "Rousseau," speaking of the very nauseous matter, conveyed in a very nauseous manner, in certain too famous passages of that philosopher's "Confessions," he observes: "This morbid form of self-feeling is only less disgusting than the allied form which clothes itself in the phrases of religious exaltation." And he adds: "Blot out half-a-dozen pages from Rousseau's "Confessions," and the egotism is no more perverted than in the "Confessions" of Augustine."†

Sometimes comparison is used by Mr. Morley for the purpose of directly recommending that "more generous morality" by which he would supersede the received ethical doctrines—"the pedantic formulas of unreal ethics,"‡ he calls them. Thus, after allowing that "no word is to be said in extenuation of Rousseau's crime" in sending his new-born children, one after another, to the Foundling Hospital, he proceeds:

At any rate, let Rousseau be a little free from excessive reproach from all clergymen, sentimentalists, and others, who do their worst to uphold the common and rather bestial opinion in favour of reckless propagation, and who, if they do not advocate the despatch of children to public institutions, still encourage a selfish incontinence which ultimately falls in burdens on others than the offenders, and which turns the family into a scene of squalor and brutishness, producing a kind of parental influence that is far more disastrous and demoralizing than the absence of it in public institutions can possibly be. If the propagation of children without regard to their maintenance be either a virtue or a necessity, and if afterwards the only alternatives are their maintenance in an asylum, on the one hand, or in the degradation of a poverty-stricken home on the other, we should not hesitate to give people who act as Rousseau acted all that credit for self-denial and high moral courage which he so audaciously claimed for himself. It really seems to be no more criminal to produce children with the deliberate intention of abandoning them to public charity, as Rousseau did, than it is to produce them in deliberate reliance on the besotted maxim that he who sends mouths will send meat, or any other of the spurious saws which make Providence do duty for self-control, and add to the gratification of physical appetite the grotesque luxury of religious unction.§

* "Miscellanies," vol. iii. p. 278.

† "Rousseau," vol. ii. p. 303. So in the next page: "No monk or saint ever wrote anything more revolting in its blasphemous self-feeling."

‡ "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 6.

§ "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 127.

My readers have probably had enough to show how ardently Mr. Morley sympathizes with Voltaire's aspiration, *écraser l'Infâme*, and how skilfully he employs the same weapons which that philosopher was wont to wield. As might be expected the ministers of the *Infâme* fare as badly at his hands as their Divinity. He pronounces the main notes of the sacerdotal temperament to be "thin unction," and "private leanings to the cord and stake." * He is of opinion that "an archbishop owes it to himself to blaspheme against freedom and reason, in superlatives of malignant unction." † The severest thing he can bring himself to say of Voltaire is that "he often sank to the level of ecclesiastics." ‡ And he pleads in extenuation of a certain perjury committed by Diderot, that "such an apostle of the new doctrine was perhaps good enough for the preachers of the old." § "Theologians," he maintains, "rest on the vileness of men," while the apostles of the new faith—Condorcet, for example—"rest on their goodness." || To "orthodox apologists" "the stern and serene composure of the historic conscience is always unknown : " ¶ there is no exception, from the days of Justin Martyr to the days of Cardinal Newman. The clergy are essentially lovers of despotism and haters of liberty. "When the people take their own government into their own hands, the clergy are sure to turn cold or apathetic towards improvement." ** Of the early martyrs, who, with their eyes fixed on the Cross of Christ, counted it joy to be admitted to the fellowship of His sufferings, he pronounces dogmatically that "their solace was found in barbarous mysteries." †† Baptism he speaks of as "a mere mummerly : " ‡‡ one, as I suppose, of those "mere mockeries of the shrine of the Hebrew divinity now made plain to scornful eyes." §§ It is of course against the Catholic Church, as the great fortress and bulwark of historic Christianity, that Mr. Morley chiefly directs the heavy artillery of his flouts and gibes. But to Protestantism, if really earnest, he is hardly less hostile. "The great evangelical revival," he holds, "has deeply warped intellectual growth in England." |||| And if, on the whole, he views Protestantism with greater indulgence than Catholicity, it is because he regards it as inchoate scepticism, sure to issue eventually in bald deism or even in sheer atheism. He observes that it was through Voltaire that "the free and protesting genius of the Reforma-

* "Miscellanies," vol. i. p. 44.

† *Ibid.* p. 84.

‡ "Miscellanies," vol. ii. p. 241.

** *Ibid.* p. 127.

†† "Compromise," p. 187.

|||| "Voltaire," p. 96.

† "Rousseau," vol. ii. p. 83.

§ "Diderot," vol. i. p. 111.

¶ *Ibid.*

‡‡ "Rousseau," vol. ii. p. 279.

§§ "Rousseau," vol. ii. p. 201.

tion, late and changed, but directly of descent, made its decisive entry into France."* He judges, however, that "the Protestant dilution of the theological spirit seems to be, in the long run, a more effective preparation for decisive abandonment of it, than virulent dissolution in the bitter acids of Voltairism."† Even the moral character of the Divine Founder of Christianity does not escape his acrid criticism. Thus does he take to task the late Mr. Mill for the tribute paid by that philosopher to the stainless perfection of Christ:

This unconditioned exaltation of the Christ of the Gospels as "the pattern of perfection for humanity," as "the ideal representative and guide," and so forth, can only be possible to such a moralist as Mr. Mill was, or as any enlightened person of our day must be, by means of a process of selection and arbitrary rejection. We may, no doubt—and many of us do—construct an ideal figure out of the sayings, the life, and the character of the great figure of the Gospels. Mr. Mill's panegyric should remind us that we do this only on condition of shutting our eyes to about one-half of the portraits as drawn in the Gospels. I mean that not merely are some essential elements of the highest morality omitted, but that there are positive injunctions and positive traits recorded which must detract in the highest degree from the justice of an unqualified eulogium. Mr. Mill allows in one place (p. 98) that the noble moralities of Christ are "mixed with some poetical exaggerations, and some maxims of which it is difficult to ascertain the precise object." This is far too moderate an account of the matter. There are sayings morally objectionable and superstitious in the highest degree, and we have no more right arbitrarily to shift the discredit of these on to the shoulders of the disciples or narrators than we have to deny to them all possibility of credit for what is admirable. This, however, is a side of the argument which it would perhaps do more harm than good to press. Even an excessive admiration for a benign and nobly pitiful character is so attractive and so wholesome, that one can have scanty satisfaction in searching for defective traits. That Mr. Mill should have committed himself to a position which calls for this deprecatory withdrawal from the critic, is one of the puzzles and perplexities of the book. It is astonishing that he should not have seen that his conception of the character of the Prophet of Nazareth was moulded in obedience to his own subjective requirements in the way of ethical beauty, and could only be made to correspond with the objective picture in the Gospel record by means of an arbitrary suppression of some of the most remarkable sayings and striking traits. It is a process in fashion. Human experience has widened; many narrow superstitions have dropped off; the notion of right and duty has been impregnated with new ingredients; the ideal has changed. Then we proceed to the anachronism of fastening the new ideal on our

* "Voltaire," p. 9.

† *Ibid.* p. 220.

favourite figures of antique days, without regard either to obvious historic conditions or to the plain and unmistakable letter of the antique record. "One of the hardest burdens," as Mr. Mill says, "laid upon the other good influences of human nature has been that of improving religion itself" (p. 75). Let us carefully abstain, then, from falsifying the history of the development of human nature by imputing, either to the religions of the past, or to their founders, perfections of which it is historically impossible that either one or the other should have been possessed. Let us not assume that Christ was so infinitely "over the heads of his reporters," to use Mr. Arnold's phrase, and then proceed to construct an arbitrary anthology of sayings which we choose to accept as Christ's on the strength of this assumption. It were surely more consonant with intelligence of method to content ourselves with tracing in Christ, as in the two or three other great teachers of the world, who are hardly beneath him in psychologic efficacy, such words and traits as touch our spiritual sense and fit in with the later and more mature perceptions of the modern time. And why should we not do this without fretting against discords in act or speech that were only to be expected from the conditions; and still more, without straining our own intelligence, and coercing the record into yielding us a picture of transcendent and impossible faultlessness? *

These extracts will perhaps be sufficient to exhibit Mr. Morley's position with regard to the conflict between the Gospel of the first century and the Gospel of the eighteenth—between Christianity and the Revolution. As he himself tersely sums the matter up: "Those who agree with the present writer, positively, absolutely, and without reserve, reject as false the whole system of objective propositions which make up the popular belief of the day, in one and all of its theological expressions." † Let us now sit at his feet awhile to learn some particulars of the new religion which he would have us embrace, and see what he has to tell us of its faith and morals.

And first, let us go back to the two momentous questions which Mr. Morley justly discerns as lying at the bottom of all the great discussions of modern society—Whether there is a God, and whether the soul is immortal? To both these questions Mr. Morley's new gospel gives us a negative answer. I do not mean to say that Mr. Morley professes dogmatic Atheism in express terms, although he manifests much admiration for its professors, ‡ as being, at all events, much more sensible than the Theists. His own opinion seems to be that

* *Fortnightly Review*, vol. xxiii. p. 120. † "Compromise," p. 160.

‡ "The Atheists . . . were, in effect, the teachers of public spirit and beneficence" ("Diderot," vol. ii. p. 190). At p. 157 he tells us that the Church "has borrowed from them the principles of humanity and tolerance."

the existence of God is "an insoluble question."* And he has not the least sympathy with "the sentimental juvenilities of children crying for the light."† He intimates, not obscurely, that if there is any God, He cannot be, as Christianity teaches, Love; nay, that He cannot be benevolent, nor even ethical. Admirable master of language as he is, he appears to be at a loss for words adequate to the expression of his contempt for those fatuous persons who "find joy in meditating upon the moral perfections of the Omnipotent Being, for whose diversion the dismal panorama of all the evil work done under the sun was bidden to unfold itself, and who sees that it is very good."‡ And in criticizing Mr. Mill, he writes as follows:—

It is conceivable that the world may have been created by a Being who is not good, not pitiful, not benevolent, not just; a Being no more entitled to our homage or worship than Francesco Cenci was entitled to the filial piety of his unhappy children. Why not? Morality concerns the conduct and relations of human beings, and of them only. We cannot know, nor indeed does it seem easy to believe, that the principles which cover the facts of social relationship must therefore be adequate to guide or explain the motions of a Demiurgos, holding the universal ordering in the hollow of his hand. To insist on rejecting any theory of creation which forbids us to predicate anything of the Creator in terms of morality, seems as unphilosophical as to insist on rejecting the evolutionary theory of the origin of the human species on the ground that it robs man of his nobility and dignity. If any one feels bound to praise and worship the Creator, he is bound to invest the object of his worship with praiseworthy attributes. But a philosopher is not bound to do anything except to explain the facts.§

Mr. Morley's practical conclusion is, that sensible men will be content to be what St. Paul calls ἀθεοὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, "without God in the world," and is thus expressed in a passage of his Rousseau :

Rousseau urged that Voltaire robbed men of their only solace. What Voltaire really did urge was that the solace derived from the attribution of humanity and justice to the Supreme Being, and from the metaphysical account of evil, rests upon too narrow a base either to cover the facts, or to be a true solace to any man who thinks and observes. He ought to have gone on, if it had only been possible in those times, to persuade his readers that there is no solace attainable, except that of an energetic fortitude.||

The Gospel of the Revolution, then, is devoid of any Theistic conception. And the place which God holds in the old faith is to

* "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 316.

† "Voltaire," p. 69.

‡ "Miscellanies," vol. iii. p. 84.

§ *Fortnightly Review*, vol. xxiii. p. 122.

|| "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 318.

be filled in the new by Man. It is, in point of fact, a kind of Positivism. Mr. Morley expresses his firm belief that "the coming modification of religion will undoubtedly rest upon the solidarity of mankind, as Comte said." * And in the spirit of that philosopher he would have men "turn back to the history of their own kind, to the long chronicle of its manifold experiences, for an adequate system of life and an inspiring social faith." † "Acquiescence in Naturalism" he praises as "wise and not inglorious." ‡ "Materialistic solutions in the science of man" § commend themselves to him. He admits "that it may be useful for the purposes of classification to divide a man into body and soul, even when we believe the soul to be only a function of the body;" || which is clearly his own opinion. The spirit, he holds, is "annihilated" by death. ¶ He tells us that "the only means through which the basis for a true Positivism can be firmly laid" is "to establish at the bottom of men's minds the habit of seeking explanations of all phenomena in experience, and building up from the beginning the great Positive principle that we can only know phenomena, and can only know them experientially." ** Perhaps the fullest exposition of his views on this important matter is conveyed in the following passage, which, moreover, is well worth citing for its literary excellence :—

Positivity is the cardinal condition of strength for times when theology lies in decay, and the abstractions which gradually replaced the older gods have in their turn ceased to satisfy the intelligence and mould the will. All competent persons agree that it is the first condition of the attainment of scientific truth. Nobody denies that men of action find in it the first law of successful achievement in the material order. Its varied but always superlative power in the region of æsthetics is only an object of recent recognition, though great work enough has been done in past ages by men whose recognition was informal and inexpress. It is plain that, in the different classes of æsthetic manifestation there will be differences in objective shape and colour, corresponding to the varied limits and conditions of the matter with which the special art has to deal; but the critic may expect to find in all a profound unity of subjective impression, and that, the impression of a self-sustaining order and a self-sufficing harmony among all those faculties and parts and energies of universal life, which come within the idealizing range of art. In other words, the

* "Miscellanies," vol. iii. p. 50.

† *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 220.

‡ *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 179.

§ "Diderot," vol. i. p. 8.

|| "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 81.

¶ "Miscellanies," vol. ii. p. 210. Elsewhere he speaks of death as "an eternal sleep" ("Miscellanies," vol. i. p. 35).

** *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 73.

characteristically modern inspiration is the inspiration of law. The regulated play of forces shows itself as fit to stir those profound emotional impulses which wake the artistic soul, as ever did the gracious or terrible gods of antique or middle times. There are glories in Turner's idealization of the energies of matter, which are at least as nobly imaginative and elevated, in spite of the conspicuous absence of the human element in them, as the highest products of the artists who believed that their work was for the service and honour of a deity.

It is as mistaken to suppose that this conviction of the supremacy of a cold and self-sustained order in the universe is fatal to emotional expansion, as it would be to suppose it fatal to intellectual curiosity. Experience has shown in the scientific sphere, that the gradual withdrawal of natural operations from the grasp of the imaginary volitions of imaginary beings has not tamed, but greatly stimulated and fertilized scientific curiosity as to the conditions of these operations. Why should it be otherwise in the æsthetic sphere? Why should all that part of our mental composition which responds to the beautiful and imaginative expression of real truths, be at once inflamed and satisfied by the thought that our whole lives, and all the movements of the universe, are the objects of the inexplicable caprice of Makers who are also Destroyers, and yet grow cold, apathetic, and unproductive, in the shadow of the belief that we can only know ourselves as part of the stupendous and inexorable succession of phenomenal conditions, moving according to laws that may be formulated positively, but not interpreted morally, to new destinies that are eternally unfathomable? Why should this conception of a coherent order, free from the arbitrary and presumptuous stamp of certain final causes, be less favourable, either to the ethical or the æsthetic side of human nature, than the older conception of the regulation of the course of the great series by a multitude of intrinsically meaningless and purposeless volitions? The alertness of our sensations for all sources of outer beauty remains unimpaired. The old and lovely attitude of devout service does not pass away to leave vacancy, but is transformed into a yet more devout obligation and service towards creatures that have only their own fellowship and mutual ministry to lean upon; and if we miss something of the ancient solace of special and personal protection, the loss is not unworthily made good by the growth of an imperial sense of participation in the common movement and equal destination of eternal forces.

To have a mind penetrated with this spiritual persuasion, is to be in full possession of the highest strength that man can attain. It springs from a scientific and rounded interpretation of the facts of life, and is in a harmony, which freshly found truths only make more ample and elaborate, with all the conclusions of the intellect in every order. The active energies are not paralyzed by the possibilities of enfeebling doubt, nor the reason drawn down and stultified by apprehension lest its methods should discredit a document, or its inferences clash with a dogma, or its light flash unseasonably on a mystery. There is none of the baleful distortion of hate, because evil and

wrongdoing and darkness are acknowledged to be effects of causes, sums of conditions, terms in a series; they are to be brought to their end, or weakened and narrowed, by right action and endeavour, and this endeavour does not stagnate in antipathy, but concentrates itself in transfixing a cause. In no other condition of the spirit than this, in which firm acquiescence mingles with valorous effort, can a man be so sure of raising a calm gaze and an enduring brow to the cruelty of circumstance. The last appalling stroke of annihilation itself is measured with purest fortitude by one, whose religious contemplation dwells most habitually upon the sovereignty of obdurate laws in the vast revolving circle of physical forces, on the one hand, and, on the other, upon that moral order which the vision and pity of good men for their fellows, guiding the spontaneous energy of all men in strife with circumstance, have raised into a structure sublimer and more amazing than all the majesty of outer nature." *

"Our new creed," Mr. Morley modestly admits, is "rudimentary."† Still, its main outlines are, perhaps, indicated with sufficient clearness in the passages which I have cited. At its present stage of development, indeed, it is affirmative chiefly in negation. "Whosoever will be saved," it proclaims, "must before all things reject the elder gods," to whom Mr. Morley will not so much as "offer a pinch of incense."‡ Turn we to the ethics of the new religion.

Now, as a matter of fact, the morality of the old religion has rested upon the two great positions which the new rejects—belief in the existence of God, and belief in the immortality of the soul. Kant judged these beliefs to be necessary postulates of ethics. Mr. Morley thinks differently. "If the Deity is not good in the same sense as men are said to be good"—and such unquestionably is Mr. Morley's opinion of "the Hebrew divinity," § should such a Being really exist—"then it is a depraving mockery to make morality consist in doing his will." || While "the natural effect of loss of belief in a future state is an energetic interest in arrangements for improving the lot of man in this

* "Miscellanies," vol. i. p. 236.

† "Compromise," p. 167.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 195. So at p. 75: "To have been deprived of the faith of the old dispensation is the first condition of strenuous endeavour after the new."

§ He speaks of Voltaire's "Epistle to Uranie" as "that truly masculine and terse protest against the popular creed, its mean and fatuous and contradictory idea of an omnipotent God, who gave us guilty hearts so as to have the right of punishing us, and planted in us a love of pleasure so as to torment us the more effectually by appalling ills that an eternal miracle prevents from ever ending, who drowned the fathers in the deluge and then died for the children, who exacts an account of their ignorance from a hundred peoples whom he has plunged helplessly into this ignorance."

|| *Fortnightly Review*, vol. xxiii. p. 122.

life." * Does the reader demur to this *ipse dixit* as opposed to the experience of mankind in all ages? Mr. Morley will prove its truth by one conclusive example. Consider Chaumette, he urges—Chaumette,† “the fiery apostle” of the dogma that death is an eternal sleep; the inventor of the worship of Reason. If you are not fully convinced of the truth of Mr. Morley’s thesis when you reflect upon the nature of Chaumette’s “arrangements for improving the lot of men in this life,” if you experience misgivings when you recall the direction which his energy took, you are clearly still in the “gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity,” you have no dispositions for faith in the new religion. Let once the bright beams which stream from “the party of illumination” enter your mind, and then assuredly you will perceive, in the light of this great example, that “men will be more likely to have a deeper love for those about them, and a keener dread of filling a home with aching hearts, if they courageously realized from the beginning of their days that . . . the black and horrible grave is indeed the end.” ‡

But let us proceed. The morality of the old religion was bound up with the belief in man’s liberty of volition. Human personality it regarded as manifested under the condition of free will, influenced but not coerced by motives, endowed with power of choice between alternative courses. Upon this foundation rested the whole edifice of man’s duty, public and private. The human *can* was the correlative of the divine *ought*. But if there is no God, the Creator, Sovereign, and Judge of men, and man is a mere machine with no more soul than a steam-engine, we are reduced to determinism, which, indeed, is a primary dogma of the new religion. And so Mr. Morley pronounces that “the doctrine of free will is virtually unmeaning”§ —as to him it of course must be—and to the fatuous persons who believe it he opposes “sensible people who accept the scientific account of human action.” “*Sapientes qui sentiunt mecum.*” Still, those of us who are thus under sentence of intellectual reprobation may find some consolation in the thought that we are in the company of Plato and Aristotle, of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, of Leibnitz and Kant. Let us now see how Mr. Morley proposes to get ethics out of necessarianism :

This brings us to Holbach’s treatment of Morals. The moment

* “Miscellanies,” vol. i. p. 78.

† “Chaumette showed the natural effect of abandoning belief in another life by his energetic interest in arrangements for improving the lot of man in this” (“Miscellanies,” vol. i. p. 78). To the first part of this proposition, at all events, we may assent, and it is always a pleasure to agree with Mr. Morley if one can. Chaumette undoubtedly is an excellent example of “the natural effect of abandoning belief in another life.”

‡ “Rousseau,” vol. i. p. 220.

§ “Miscellanies,” vol. i. p. 236.

had come to France which was reached at an earlier period in English speculation, when the negative course of thought in metaphysics drove men to consider the basis of ethics. How were right and wrong to hold their own against the new mechanical conception of the Universe ?

* * * * *

Holbach begins by a most unflinching exposure of the inconsistency with all that we know of Nature, of the mysterious theory of Free Will. This remains one of the most effective parts of the book, and perhaps the work has never been done with a firmer hand. The conclusion is expressed with a decisiveness that almost seems crude. There is declared to be no difference between a man who throws himself out of the window and the man whom I throw out, except this, that the impulse acting on the second comes from without, and that the impulse determining the fall of the first comes from within his own mechanism. You have only to get down to the motive, and you will invariably find that the motive is beyond the actor's own power or reach. The inexorable logic with which the author presses the Free-Willer from one retreat to another, and from shift to shift, leaves his adversary at last exactly as naked and defenceless before Holbach's vigorous and thoroughly realized Naturalism as the same adversary must always be before Jonathan Edwards' vigorous theism. "The system of man's liberty," Holbach says (II. ii.) with some pungency, "seems only to have been invented in order to put him in a position to offend his God, and so to justify God in all the evil that he inflicted on man, for having used the freedom which was so disastrously conferred upon him."

If man be not free, what right have we to punish those who cannot help committing bad actions, or to reward others who cannot help committing good actions? Holbach gives to this and the various other ways of describing fatalism as dangerous to society the proper and perfectly adequate answer. He turns to the quality of the action, and connects with that the social attitude of praise and blame. Merit and demerit are associated with conduct according as it is thought to affect the common welfare advantageously or the reverse. My indignation and my approval are as necessary as the acts that excite these sentiments. My feelings are neither more nor less spontaneous than the deciding motives of the actor. Whatever be the necessitating cause of our actions, I have a right to do my best by praise and blame, by reward and punishment, to strengthen or to weaken, to prolong or to divert, the motives that are the antecedents of the action; exactly as I have a right to dam up a stream, or to divert its course, or otherwise deal with it to suit my own convenience. Penal laws, for instance, are ways of offering to men strong motives, to weigh in the scale against the temptation of immediate personal gratification.

* * * * *

Holbach answers effectively enough the common objection that his fatalism would plunge men's souls into apathy. If all is necessary, why should I not let things go, and myself remain quiet? As if we could stay our hands from action, if our feelings were trained to proper sensibility and sympathy. As if it were possible for a man of tender

disposition not to interest himself keenly in all that concerns the lot of his fellow-creatures. How does our knowledge that death is necessary prevent us from deploring the loss of a beloved one? How does my consciousness that it is the inevitable property of fire to burn, prevent me from using all my efforts to prevent a conflagration?

Finally, when people urge that the doctrine of necessity degrades man by reducing him to a machine, and likening him to some growth of abject vegetation, they are merely using a kind of language that was invented in ignorance of what constitutes the true dignity of man. What is nature itself but a vast machine, in which our human species is no more than one weak spring? The good man is a machine whose springs are adapted so to fulfil their functions as to produce beneficent results for his fellows. How could such an instrument not be an object of respect and affection and gratitude?

In closing this part of Holbach's book, while not dissenting from his conclusions, we will only remark how little conscious he seems of the degree to which he empties the notions of praise and blame of the very essence of their old contents. It is not a modification, but the substitution of a new meaning under the old names. Praise in its new sense of admiration for useful and pleasure-giving conduct or motive, is as powerful a force and as adequate an incentive to good conduct and good motives as praise in the old sense of admiration for a deliberate and voluntary exercise of a free-acting will. But the two senses are different. The old ethical association is transformed into something which usage and the requirements of social self-preservation must make equally potent, but which is not the same. If Holbach and others who hold necessarian opinions were to perceive this more frankly, and to work it out fully, they would prevent a confusion that is very unfavourable to them in the minds of most of those whom they wish to persuade. It is easy to see that the work next to be done in the region of morals is the readjustment of the ethical phraseology of the volitional stage, to fit the ideas proper to the stage in which man has become as definitely the object of science as any of the other phenomena of the universe.*

It has been my object in this paper rather accurately to expound than formally to refute Mr. Morley's opinions. To speak plainly—which I trust I may do without incurring the imputation of discourtesy—his opinions seldom seem to me worth the trouble of refuting. But before I go on, I may observe upon the passage which I have just cited, that it does not give one a very exalted impression of Mr. Morley's capacity for philosophical inquiry. If men be not free, what right have we to punish those who cannot help committing bad actions, or to reward others who cannot help committing good actions? That is the question. Holbach's answer is in effect: We may praise or blame a machine according as it gives us pleasure or

* "Diderot," vol. ii. p. 178.

pain; and if the machine is intelligent, our praise or blame will supply motives for its acts. This answer Mr. Morley commends as "proper, and perfectly adequate." It is true, he adds, that Holbach thus "empties the notions of praise and blame of the very essence of their old contents." Of course this is true. And that—although Mr. Morley quite fails to perceive it—is a sufficient answer to Holbach. An ethical element is of the essence of what we mean by praise or blame. And for that element there is no room in the philosophy of Holbach or of Mr. Morley. Hence they are under the necessity of denying it, or of explaining it away, as Mr. Morley seeks to do when he grotesquely tells us that "a machine whose springs are adapted so to fulfil their functions as to produce beneficent results"—a "patent self-guiding perambulator," for example—must "be an object of respect, and affection, and gratitude." No. The moral element in praise or blame is not artificial. It is in the nature of men, and no fork of determinism will expel it thence. "I have a right to do my best, by praise and blame, by reward and punishment, to strengthen or to weaken, to prolong or to divert, the motives that are the antecedents of the action, exactly as I have a right to dam up a stream, or to divert its course, or otherwise deal with it, to suit my own convenience." Surely this is what Sir Toby Belch would call "exceeding good senseless." Right! Why every one has a right to do what he cannot help doing. The word "right" implies moral quality. But if our actions, good or bad, are simply the necessitated outcome of machinery, moral quality does not exist in them. "As if we could stay our hands from action, if our feelings were trained to proper sensibility and sympathy!" But if they are not so trained, the reason is that they cannot be trained, and it is no one's fault, but arises from the nature of the machine: "*velle non discitur*" is an axiom of determinism. "As if it were possible for a man of tender disposition not to interest himself keenly in all that concerns the lot of his fellow-creatures!" But men are not, as a rule, of tender disposition. Nor assuredly will the philosophy of Mr. Morley make them such. Empty men of the notion of God, which you denounce, with Mr. Morley, as hateful and ridiculous; abolish the old volitional morality, as "the pedantic requirements of unreal ethics," and substitute for it "usage and the requirements of social self-preservation;" teach man that his real dignity lies in this—that he is "one weak spring" in "the vast machine of nature," and, in point of fact, you hand over the human mammal, helpless and impotent, to the blind impulses of egoism, to the terrible heritage of savage instincts, accumulated in his nervous system, and now barely held in check by religion

and philosophy. The work of civilization is undone, and "homo homini lupus" is again the true account of the human race. "Sensibility," and "sympathy," and "tender disposition!" * I confess this cant sickens me. The image of Joseph Surface rises before my mind, and I incline to say with old Sir Peter Teazle, "Oh! damn your sentiment." One knows very well what the issue of it really is; and how these rose-water revolutionists who set out with affirming that all is good in man's nature, end by finding the human race "suspect." Mr. Morley, as we have seen, professes to go by the facts. He glorifies "the great positive principle" that "we can only know phenomena, and know them only experientially." Let him keep to the phenomena of human life, and assuredly the optimistic haze in which he views it will soon fade away. As assuredly, experience will certify to him the fact that our motives can be within our power. "Sir, we know that our will is free, and there's an end of it," said Dr. Johnson. Of course this dictum requires to be limited and guarded, and thrown into scientific shape, before a metaphysician can accept it. But it is a rough-and-ready expression of a truth overwhelmingly demonstrated by the every-day experience of life, to which alone Mr. Morley, upon his own principles, has a right to refer. As to the argument from inanimate nature, where we all admit that necessity rules, to that which happens in what—*pace* Mr. Morley—is another province altogether, the human spirit, it is altogether irrational. "It is"—as a brilliant friend of my own has remarked with equal truth and pungency—it is "like saying that sight is impossible because we have no eyes in the stomach." For the rest, the practical consequences to human society of the ethics, or unethics, taught by the new religion, appear to me to be abundantly clear. What they are I pointed out elsewhere † a short time ago, in words which, as I cannot find others better to express my meaning, I may be allowed to repeat here:—

With what is called metaphysical liberty, with freedom of volition, merit and demerit disappear too. Human causality, human spontaneity, human responsibility, all die before the "uncreating word" of materialism. Its doctrine of absolute irresponsibility makes an end of ethics; its criminal legislation can be nothing but *vanæ sine moribus leges*. For the sting of punishment is not the actual fact—"stone walls do not a prison make"—but the moral disapprobation of which the fact is evidence. But how visit with moral disapprobation those

* The "great central moral doctrine" of the Revolution, Mr. Morley tells us, is "that human nature is good, and that the evil of the world is the fruit of bad education and bad institutions" ("Diderot," vol. i. p. 5).

† See my article "Materialism and Morality" in the *Fortnightly Review* of November last.

who were incapable of doing anything but what they did? Poor victims of temperament, of heredity, of environment, they are to be pitied, not blamed; while, indeed, we seclude them for the protection of our persons and pockets; for we are the numerical majority, we can appeal to the *ultima ratio* of force, if to nothing higher. It is no fancy picture which I am now drawing. Fifty years ago Balzac wrote: "Crime has been made poetical; tears are drivelled over assassins." True as his words were then, they are even truer now. The idea of law as the embodied conscience of a nation of persons, the belief in justice, in the old sense, as something quite transcending mere expediency—*fiat justitia pereat mundus*—the conception of the civil magistrate as a minister of the retribution ordained by that justice as "the other half of crime"—these things have well nigh died out from the popular mind, as, in place of the old spiritual principles of ethics, materialism refers us to natural history.

Such, as it seems to me, will be the effect upon the public order of that determinism which is a primary dogma of the revolutionary religion. The bond* of civil society is obedience to law, fenced round with penalties. But legislation rests upon the doctrine of human responsibility. To that doctrine necessitarianism is fatal. But if law, with penal sanctions, be the bond of civil society, the family is certainly its foundation. Where wedlock and legal paternity are unknown, and complete promiscuity prevails in the relations of the sexes—as among the aborigines of Australia and Fiji—civilization does not exist. The State depends upon the family, and the family depends upon marriage. Now, marriage, as it is still found in Europe, is mainly the creation of Christianity. Wordsworth gave utterance to no poetical fancy, but to the exact truth, when he sang of "pure religion breathing household laws." What will become of marriage, and of that virtue of purity of which it is the guardian, when the new religion imposes its ethics on the world, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ is superseded by the Gospel of the Revolution?

Let us ever remember that the first law of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is self-denial: conformity to the mind of the Master, who pleased not Himself: the taking up of His cross: the immolation thereon of the flesh, with its affections and lusts. As I have observed in a recent work:

There can be no question at all that Christianity presented itself to the decadent and moribund civilization of the Roman Empire as an ascetic doctrine: a doctrine of abstinence, not only from the things which it branded as positively sinful, but from things in themselves licit. The world—which St. John exhorts his disciples not to love,

* "Generale quippe pactum est societatis humanæ obedire regibus suis." (St. Aug. "Confes." lib. iii. c. 8.)

because the love of it is incompatible with the love of the Father, which he describes as lying in the wicked one, which over and over again in the New Testament the disciples of Christ are bidden to forsake and overcome, and which (such is the vitality of phrases) stands even in our own day for the complete antithesis of the Church—is the present visible frame of things, doomed, as these early preachers believed, soon to pass away with the lust thereof; the flesh—in which St. Paul declared no good thing to dwell, which it was his daily endeavour to keep under and bring into subjection—is the whole of man's lower or animal nature. Whatever is doubtful, this is clear. And to those who do not admit it we may say, without discourtesy, that, whether through ignorance or prejudice, they are so hopelessly in the dark on this matter as to render any argument with them regarding it mere waste of time. The principle, then, which transformed the individual by the renewing of his mind, was the principle of self-sacrifice. And this was the principle which transformed society.*

Now, the teaching of Christianity about the virtue of purity rests upon the asceticism which is so essential a part of that religion. To live out one's impulses with no restraints save those imposed by prudential moderation, was the highest counsel of that ancient naturalism which deified and worshipped the passion of desire. The precept of St. Peter is ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν : “to abstain from fleshly lusts”; and the reason he gives for such abstinence is, that they “war against the soul.” “Bonum est homini mulierem non tangere” writes St. Paul. It is a counsel of perfection, given only to those who are able to receive it. To the multitude, whose lives are led upon the lower levels of humanity, marriage is conceded *propter fornicationem*, or, as the Anglican Nuptial Service puts it, correctly interpreting the unbroken Christian tradition of fifteen centuries, “that those who have not the gift of continence might keep themselves undefiled members of Christ's body.” It is conceded, and it is transformed. From a mere civil contract it becomes “magnum sacramentum,” holy and indissoluble: the curb of man's lawless appetite and the bulwark of woman's fragile honour. There can be no question at all that upon this ascetic treatment of the most potent and deeply rooted of man's instincts, Christian civilization is based. It has been well observed by Mr. Allies :—

When [Christianity] began its great work, not only was the unity of marriage broken by repudiation of the bond and perpetual violation of its sanctity, but in the background of all civilized life lurked a host of abominations, all tending to diminish the fertility of the human race, and to destroy life in its beginning and in its progress. . . . [The Church] succeeded not only in rolling back the tide of pollution,

* “ Chapters in European History,” vol. i. p. 84.

but in establishing the basis of all social life, the unity and indissolubility of marriage. . . . The power of a sacrament had silently been insinuated into the decayed, the almost pulverized foundations of social life, and built them up with the solidity of a rock, which would bear the whole superstructure of the city of God.*

Let us turn now to the gospel of the eighteenth century, and see what is its teaching upon this matter of such ineffable importance to society. Mr. Morley, in a passage of his "*Voltaire*," thus clearly indicates the attitude of the new religion towards what he calls "the mediæval superstition about purity." † The adjective "mediæval" is, I suppose, rather vituperative than descriptive, the "superstition" in question being an essential part of Christianity, and no more peculiar to the Middle Ages than to any other period in the history of that religion:—

The peculiarity of the licence of France in the middle of the eighteenth century is, that it was looked upon with complacency by the great intellectual leaders of opinion. It took its place in the progressive formula. What austerity was to other forward movements, licence was to this. It is not difficult to perceive how so extraordinary a circumstance came to pass. Chastity was the supreme virtue in the eyes of the Church, the mystic key to Christian holiness. Continence was one of the most sacred of the pretensions by which the organized preachers of superstition claimed the reverence of men and women. It was identified, therefore, in a particular manner with that Infamous against which the main assault of the time was directed. So men contended, more or less expressly—first, that continence was no commanding chief among virtues; then that it was a very superficial and easily practised virtue; finally, that it was no virtue at all, but if sometimes a convenience, generally an impediment to free human happiness." ‡

Quite in accordance with these views of the apostles and evangelists of the new religion, Mr. Morley declares "the Catholic ideal of womanhood" to be "no more adequate to the facts of life than Catholic views about science, or property, or labour, or political order or authority." § He lifts up his testimony against "the

* "*Formation of Christendom*," vol. i. p. 306.

† "*Voltaire*," p. 152.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 149.

§ "*Diderot*," vol. i. p. 76. I trust I may, without offence, intimate my doubt whether Mr. Morley is very accurately informed regarding "Catholic views about science, or property, or labour, or political order, or authority." One instance must suffice to indicate the reason for my scepticism. In his "*Rousseau*" (vol. ii. p. 144) he writes: "The will of the prince, he (Aquinas) says, to be a law, must be directed by reason: law is appointed for the common good, and not for a special or private good: it follows from this that only the reason of the multitude, or of a prince representing the multitude, can make a law" ("*Summa*," xc.-cviii.). I know not whether to admire more the mode of reference to St. Thomas or the account of his opinion as to the source of law.

mutilating hand of religious asceticism,"* and in another place, using the same significant phrase, he declares that "every branch of the Church, from the oldest to the youngest and crudest," has in its degree afflicted and retarded mankind "with mutilation."† He cites approvingly Diderot's opinion, that "what they call evangelical perfection is only the mischievous art of stifling Nature."‡ Apparently Diderot is for Mr. Morley a special authority upon this subject. He assures us that this indescribably filthy writer, and no less filthy liver, "was keenly alive to the beauty of order [in the relations of the sexes] and domestic piety."§ There can be no room for the impression that Mr. Morley is poking fun at us. He is nothing if not serious. The judicious reader is therefore driven to the conclusion that order in the relations of the sexes, in the new religion, must be precisely what is called disorder in the old. "This may be new-fashioned modesty," exclaims poor Mr. Hardcastle; "but I never saw anything look so like old-fashioned impudence." Reverse the precepts of "pure religion breathing household laws," which have made the Christian family what it is, and apparently you will get the code of sexual morality and domestic piety prescribed by the Gospel of the Revolution. We should, however, wrong Mr. Morley if we supposed him to approve, or to recommend, unbounded licence in the gratification of the sexual appetite. On the contrary, he solemnly declares that "some continence and order in the relations of men and women is a good thing."|| "Some!" It is vague. Still, whatever it may amount to, we may be thankful for it. To speak frankly, however—and the occasion calls for plain speaking—I fear it does not amount to much. In a suggestive passage dealing with the early excesses of "the great preacher of the Declaration of the Rights of Man"—Robespierre—Mr. Morley counsels, not "the chastising, the bringing into subjection,"¶ but "the better ordering and governance of the youthful appetite," and insists that thereby "a diviner brightness would be given to the earth."** Again, in describing Rousseau's mock espousals with his filthy concubine, while declining to pronounce authoritatively whether this was or was not, "a marriage according to the truth of Nature," he admonishes us

* "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 16.

† *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 16.

‡ "Diderot," vol. i. p. 13.

§ *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 22. So in his book on Rousseau (vol. i. p. 306) he speaks of that philosopher as "a Puritan."

|| "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 218.

¶ The "castigo corpus meum et in servitutem redigo," of the Vulgate—emphatic as it is—very inadequately represents the force of the original: "ἐπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ."

** "Miscellanies," vol. i. p. 7.

that "Rousseau was as free to choose his own rites as more sacramental performers." * How deeply the traditions of the English home offend Mr. Morley may be judged from the following passage :—

There is probably no uglier growth of time than that mean and poor form of domesticity which has always been too apt to fascinate the English imagination ever since the last great effort of the Rebellion, and which rose to the climax of its popularity when George III. won all hearts by living like a farmer. Instead of the fierce light beating about a throne, it played lambently upon a sty.† And the nation who admired, imitated. When the Regent came, and with him that coarse profligacy which has alternated with cloudy insipidity in the annals of the line, the honest part of the world, out of antipathy to the son, was driven even further into domestic sentimentality of a greasy kind, than it had gone from affection for the sire. ‡

"Byron," Mr. Morley continues, "helped to clear the air of this." That apparently is his great merit, and brings him within "the progressive formula." "The domestic sentiment almost disappears in those works which made Byron most popular, or else it only appears to be banished with reproach. This is quite in accordance with the revolutionary spirit."

So much must suffice to indicate the nature of the new religion, its faith and morals, of which Mr. Morley is the zealous preacher. How burning his zeal is will have been evident from the passages of his works which I have cited. We may truly say of him, as he has truly said of Condorcet, that "there is something theological in his hatred of theology;" § that "in every page of his writings we hear the ground swell of suppressed passion;" that, "urgent, heated, impetuous, with a heavy vehemence all his own," he is "the incarnation of the Revolutionary Spirit." || His absolute sincerity is as patent as his singular literary power. I must do myself the pleasure of citing one more page—a magnificent bit of writing it is—which signally displays both these qualities :—

And what is this smile of the world, to win which we are bidden to sacrifice our moral manhood : this frown of the world, whose terrors are more awful than the withering up of truth and the slow going out of light within the souls of us ? Consider the triviality of life, and conversation, and purpose in the bulk of those whose approval is held

* "Rousseau," vol. i. p. 129.

† It is worth while to compare the judgment of M. le Play. "En Angleterre les mœurs avaient été restaurées sous la salubre influence des bons exemples donnés par George III.," writes that publicist. ("L'Organisation de Travail," p. 188.)

‡ "Miscellanies," vol. i. p. 242.

§ *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 175.

|| *Ibid.* p. 181.

out for our prize, and the mark of our high calling. Measure, if you can, the empire over them of prejudice unadulterated by a single element of rationality, and weigh, if you can, the huge burden of custom, unrelieved by a single leavening particle of fresh thought. Ponder the share which selfishness and love of ease have in the vitality and the maintenance of the opinions that we are forbidden to dispute. Then how pitiful a thing seems the approval or the disapproval of those creatures of the conventions of the hour, as one figures the merciless vastness of the universe of matter sweeping us headlong through viewless space; as one hears the wail of misery that is for ever ascending to the deaf gods; as one counts the little tale of the years that separate us from eternal silence. In the light of these things a man should surely dare to live his small span of life with little heed of the common speech upon him or his life, only caring that his days may be full of reality, and his conversation of truth-speaking and wholeness." *

Mr. Morley tells us: "A person who takes the trouble to form his own opinions and beliefs will feel that he owes no responsibility to the majority for his conclusions. . . . When he proceeds to apply his beliefs in the practical conduct of life, his position is different." † I will not at present discuss the first of these propositions. To the second I unreservedly assent, and I would observe that it has a special application to the case of Mr. Morley himself. He has told us that "literature ought to be rated below action." ‡ And we may be quite sure that what has led him to exchange the quiet of his library for the turmoil of politics is no ignoble lust of power, no vulgar craving for titular distinction; but the desire to apply his beliefs "to the practical conduct of life," and so "to render the loftier services to mankind." § We may be quite sure that the same spirit which breathes through his works will animate his political action. It is to his earnest singleness of purpose even more than to his great intellectual gifts that he owes the high position which he has so soon taken in the House of Commons. Hence the importance of correctly apprehending what that purpose is. Now, the Liberalism of which Mr. Morley is so accomplished a representative is a very different thing from the set of principles and beliefs which have hitherto in the main guided the great historic Liberal party. The watchword of that party has ever been "Civil and Religious Liberty;" and to this watchword, with whatever occasional deflections and shortcomings, it has been loyal. In my judgment we owe to that party, directly or indirectly, every wise reform, every beneficent law which for the last two centuries has found place on the Statute-book. To its

* "Compromise," p. 197.

† *Ibid.* p. 201.

‡ "Voltaire," p. 18.

§ *Ibid.* p. 17.

action, its suffering, we owe it that English freedom has "slowly broadened down," from the Bill of Rights to the last Act for the relief of religious disabilities. Mr. Morley's Liberalism is of a French, not an English type. It is sectarian rather than political. "We have no parties in my country; we have only sects," an accomplished Frenchman once observed to me. The primary object of the Revolution of which Mr. Morley avows himself a child is to efface Christianity, or, in the phrase which he adopts from Voltaire, to crush out "the Infamous." He insists strongly that those who are convinced that the Christian "dogma is not true, and that both dogma and Church must be slowly replaced by higher forms of faith"—"we have seen what those "higher forms of faith" are—have as distinctly a function in the community as the ministers and upholders of the Churches."* And that function of course is to destroy the dogma and the Church. That is the great end. The means must vary according to time and place. But there is one means just now of universal application throughout Europe, which is recommended both by its obvious efficacy and by the authority of those whose praise is in all the revolutionary churches. What this means is, let us learn from a personage who being dead yet speaketh—the late M. Paul Bert—"a new glory of the Revolution," as he has been recently designated by a sorrowful and admiring countryman. The designation seems to me very just. I discern in him a worthy successor of Chaumette, not inferior either in impiety or in ferocity to his great prototype. Unpropitious fates withheld from him the power of rivalling the exploits of that Apostle of the guillotine. He was reduced to seek his solace during the intervals of blasphemy, in the blood and cries of creatures lower than man in the scale of sentient existence. Possibly, he may have found some consolation for the inferiority of his victims in the exquisite refinements of prolonged cruelty, whereby he was wont to torture out their poor lives. He rests from his labours; and can any one, whose moral sense is not hopelessly blunted, doubt that his works do follow him? Nay, if we may accept the revelation of the Unseen given us in what, I suppose, must be accounted the *Cantica Canticorum* † among the Sacred Books of the new

* "Compromise," p. 221.

† The Song of Songs, which is Voltaire's:—

Mon cher lecteur, il est temps de te dire
Qu'un jour Satan, seigneur du sombre empire,
À ses vassaux donnait un grand régal,
Il était fête au manoir infernal.

* * * * *

Le roi cornu de la huaille noire
Se déridait entouré de ses pairs.
On s'enivrait du nectar des enfers,

religion, may we not conceive of him as welcomed with an emphatic "Chauftez-vous" by the master whom he had so long and faithfully served? He has gone to his reward; but his words remain, a light to the feet and a lantern to the paths of those who have obtained like precious faith with him. The great work immediately before them, he solemnly insisted upon a memorable occasion, is to banish religion from primary education.*

What has been done in France to carry out this counsel we all know. We know also what it is desired to do in England. Let us hear what Mr. Morley has to say upon this momentous subject, in words written originally in 1874, and reprinted, unaltered, in 1886:—

Ou fredonnait quelques chansons à boire,
Lorsqu'à la porte il s'élève un grand cri,
" Ah ! bonjour donc, vous voilà, vous voici,
C'est lui, messieurs, c'est le grand émissaire,
C'est Grisbourdon, notre féal ami ;
Entrez, entrez, et chauffez-vous ici."

("La Pucelle d'Orléans," chant v.)

* "Les religions n'ont pas qualité pour parler de morale; car elles reposent sur des bases fausses, sur des hypothèses injustifiables, sur des conceptions erronées de la nature de l'homme, de son rôle dans la société et dans le monde physique. . . . L'enseignement religieux est l'école de l'imbécillité, du fanatisme, de l'antipatriotisme et de l'immoralité. Nous avons bien fait de le chasser de l'école. . . . *Plus les sociétés s'acheminent vers la morale, plus elles s'éloignent de la religion.*" (Speech at the Cirque d'Hiver, 28th August, 1881.)

I will give an extract from another speech of M. Bert, which may with advantage be compared with some of the passages cited from Mr. Morley in this article :

"Ici, les abstrauteurs de quintessence's s'exclament de bonne ou de mauvaise foi. Ils nous disent: vous n'avez pas le droit de donner, l'enseignement moral tant que vous n'aurez pas défini la base de la morale, tant que vous n'aurez pas catégorisé d'une façon nette ce qui est le bien, ce qui est le mal; tant que vous n'aurez pas trouvé le mobile et la sanction, vous ne pourrez pas édifier votre enseignement moral. Et alors ils nous font cette condition étrange qui rappelle les contes de fées; il faut perforer à travers le marais de la métaphysique jusqu'à ce qu'on ait trouvé le roc solide—s'il y en a un.

"A ceux qui sont de mauvaise foi, en parlant ainsi, il n'y a qu'à tourner le dos. Quant aux autres, il faut leur répondre et je leur réponds: vous avez pendant des siècles, reculé la marche de l'esprit humain. Je vous connais. . . . Nous laissons là votre métaphysique. Continuez à tourner votre roue d'écureuil; quant à nous, nous avons fait une physique et une chimie qui se portent assez bien et qui font bonne figure dans le monde des sciences. Ce qu'on a fait pour les sciences physiques on le fera pour les sciences morales, et les métaphysiciens continueront pendant l'éternité cet étrange jeu qui ressemble à un jeu de bilboquet dont la boule n'aurait pas de trou." (Speech at a banquet of five hundred schoolmasters and schoolmistresses at Véfours, 18th September, 1881.)

A small and temporary improvement may really be the worst enemy of a great and permanent improvement, unless the first is made on the lines and in the direction of the second. And so it may, if it be successfully palmed off upon a society as actually being the second. In such a case as this—and our legislation presents instances of the kind—the small reform, if it be not made with reference to some large progressive principle, and with a view to further extension of its scope, makes it all the more difficult to return to the right line and direction when improvement is again demanded. To take an example which is now very familiar to us all: the Education Act of 1870 was of the nature of a small reform. No one pretends that it is anything approaching to a final solution of a complex problem. But the Government insisted, whether rightly or wrongly, that their Act was as large a measure as public opinion was at that moment ready to support. At the same time it was clearly agreed among the Government and the whole of the party at their backs, that at some time or other, near or remote, if public instruction was to be made genuinely effective, the private, voluntary, or denominational system would have to be replaced by a national system. To prepare for this ultimate replacement was one of the points to be most steadily borne in mind, however slowly and tentatively the process might be conducted. Instead of that, the authors of the Act deliberately introduced provisions for extending and strengthening the very system which will have eventually to be superseded. They thus, by their small reform, made the future great reform the more difficult of achievement.*

These words seem to me to be especially worthy of being deeply pondered. Much might be said upon them. All I shall say at present is, that I have reason to think Mr. Morley ill-informed as to that clear agreement of which he speaks. I have myself been assured by the two statesmen chiefly responsible for the Education Act of 1870, that it was not designed as a step towards the supersession of voluntary and denominational schools; that neither of them had the least intention to bring about the "future great reform" which Mr. Morley so earnestly desires, and desires naturally enough, because he is well aware that it would supply the most effective means of undermining the Christianity of England, and of making straight the paths of the new religion.

W. S. LILLY.

* "Compromise," p. 230.

ART. II.—PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN SOUTHERN INDIA—TANJORE.

MOST of the Protestant missions in India are of recent origin. Very few of them date back farther than the beginning of the present century. Among the oldest, if not the oldest of all, is the mission of Tanjore. Here Protestant missionaries have been at work for more than a hundred years. Here, if anywhere, we might expect to see at the best advantage the results of their labours.

Tanjore is a district in Southern India. The city which gives it a name stands on the lower course of the Cauvery, and the district includes the rich delta of that river. Its fertility has won it the title of the garden of Southern India. In the last century Tanjore was one of the States of the Mahratta league, but in 1799, its Rajah Sharabhoji placed his territory under British protection, and practically ceded it to the Company. On the death of his son Sivaji in 1855, the ruling family became extinct, and the annexation of the district was completed.

Early in the 17th century the Rajah of Tanjore had ceded to an enterprising Danish captain the seacoast town of Tranquebar. The place became the centre of the Danish trade with the East, and in 1706 King Frederick IV. of Denmark sent thither Ziegenbalg and Plütschan, the two first Protestant missionaries who had ever appeared in India. Tranquebar soon became the headquarters of an active Lutheran propaganda. About 1728 some native Catholics at Tanjore apostatized and became Lutherans, chiefly through the influence of a soldier who had been "converted" by the missionaries during a visit to Tranquebar. After this Tanjore was visited by Pressier, a member of the Danish mission; but it does not appear to have become a permanent centre of Lutheranism until Swartz arrived in India.

Christian Frederick Swartz * was one of the most remarkable of the early Protestant missionaries in India. He was a man of considerable mental power, with a marked talent for languages, and a great influence over the minds of other men. No one who reads his letters can doubt his earnestness and zeal for the diffusion of what he held to be the truths of Christianity. He was born at Sonnenburg, in Prussia, in 1726, and in 1750 he went out to India to take part in the labours of the Lutheran mission, of which he became before long the most active and

* The name is now often written Schwartz, but the missionary himself used to write it Swartz.

prominent member. In his missionary journeys he occasionally visited Tanjore, and in 1769 he was introduced to its ruler, Tuljaji Rajah, on whom he made such a favourable impression that their acquaintance soon ripened into friendship. After this his visits to Tanjore became more frequent, until in 1778 he established himself permanently there. By this time there was a British resident at the Court, and an English garrison at his command, so that Tuljaji was practically a tributary prince. Swartz was protected and assisted by the Rajah in various ways, and he showed his gratitude by being helpful to him when the occasion offered. Thus in 1782 he made him a loan of about £400.* Five years later when Tuljaji was on his death-bed he adopted as his son a young prince of his house, named Sharabhaji, appointing his brother, Amir Singh, regent during his minority, and Swartz his tutor. Before he died, Tuljaji handed to the missionary "a written document, sealed by himself and his chief ministers, in which he made an appropriation for ever of a village, of the yearly income of about five hundred pagodas (£200), for the school, and more especially for the orphans."† This was not the only grant Swartz received for his mission from the authorities at Tanjore. Later on we find him accepting a monthly grant in aid of the Protestant poor of an adjacent mission. There is no doubt that he accepted these grants in a most disinterested spirit, and used them with prudent care that they should not degenerate into bribes for proselytes; but in the hands of less worthy, or less prudent successors, the funds of the Tanjore mission have proved, as we shall see, a fatal possession.

Swartz died in 1798; it says much for him that he was all his life opposed to the marriage of missionaries. He held that men who came to do such work should be wholly devoted to it, and should have no other interests in the world, and he practised what he preached. Self-interest of any kind had no part in his character. He had unbounded influence with the successive rulers of Tanjore, and with the East India Company's representatives in Southern India, and there is no doubt that he used it only for the advantage of the people among whom he laboured.

Swartz worked at Tanjore in connection with the English Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, to which he had transferred himself from the Danish mission some time after his arrival in India.‡ The establishments of the Danish mission at Tranquebar were, in 1841, handed over to the Leipzig

* Pearson: "Memoirs of Swartz," ii. 145.

† *Ibid.* ii. 146.

‡ In 1826 the S.P.C.K. transferred its missions in the Madras Presidency to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Madras Diocesan Committee was formed in connection with the S.P.G. to direct them.

Evangelical Lutheran Mission. In most India districts, by an arrangement between the missionary societies, only one of the various forms of Protestantism is presented to the natives. In the Tanjore district this convenient arrangement does not exist. The Danes have gone from Tranquebar, but the German Lutherans have taken their place, and pushed their operations to Tanjore itself. There is therefore a standing quarrel in the district between the representatives of Lutheranism and those of Anglicanism. Both claim "Father Swartz" as their own.

It is not easy to say how many or how few Protestants there were in Tanjore at the death of Swartz. Dean Pearson, his biographer, gives no statistics. Three years later, however, in 1801, Gericke, his successor, reports : * "It is delightful to see the growth of the Tanjore mission, and the southern congregations dependent on it. The inhabitants of whole villages flock to it. What a pity that there are not labourers for such a great and delightful harvest!" Our business, however, is mainly with the condition of Tanjore at a much more recent date. But before we pass on to these matters, we have a glimpse of the state of the mission some thirty years after the death of its founder. In 1834, Macaulay wrote home from his summer quarters in the Nilgheries † :—

By all that I can learn the Catholics are the most respectable portion of the native Christians. As to Swartz's people in the Tanjore, they are a perfect scandal to the religion which they profess. It would have been thought something little short of blasphemy to say this a year ago; but now it is considered impious to say otherwise, for they have got into a violent quarrel with the missionaries and the bishop. The missionaries refused to recognize the distinctions of caste in the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the bishop supported them in the refusal. I do not pretend to judge whether this was right or wrong. Swartz and Bishop Heber conceived that the distinction of caste, however objectionable politically, was still only a distinction of rank; and that as in English churches the gentlefolk generally take the sacrament apart from the poor of the parish, so the high-caste natives might be allowed to communicate apart from the pariahs. But whoever was first in the wrong, the Christians of Tanjore took care to be most so. They called in the interposition of Government, and sent up such petitions and memorials as I never saw before or since; made up of lies, invectives, bragging, cant, bad grammar of the most ludicrous kind, and texts of Scripture quoted without the smallest application. I remember one passage by heart, which is really only a fair specimen of the whole :—"These missionaries, my lord, loving only filthy lucre, bid us eat Lord supper

* "Memoirs of Swartz," ii. 441.

† "Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay," ed. 1878, vol. i. pp. 383, 384.

with pariahs as lives ugly, handling dead men, drinking rack and toddy, sweeping the streets, mean fellows altogether, base persons, contrary to that which St. Paul saith : 'I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.' . . . I could not help saying to one of the missionaries who is here on the hills, that I thought it a pity to break up the church of Tanjore on account of a matter which Swartz and Heber had not been inclined to regard as essential. "Sir," said the reverend gentleman, "the sooner the church of Tanjore is broken up the better. You can form no notion of the worthlessness of the native Christians there." I could not dispute the point with him ; but neither could I help thinking, though I was too polite to say so, that it was hardly worth the while of so many good men to come 15,000 miles over sea and land in order to make proselytes, who, their very instructors being judges, were more children of hell than before.

Let us now see if matters have improved much in fifty years in this the oldest Protestant mission in India. The last census (1881) gives the following religious statistics for the Tanjore district. Out of a total population of 2,130,383, there are 1,939,421 Hindus, 112,058 Mohammedans, and 78,258 Christians. Of the Christians, no less than 67,292 are returned as Roman Catholics ; and of some seventeen hundred Christians the precise denomination is not stated. This leaves some 9,000 non-Catholics who are thus divided among the sects :—

"Protestants" . . .	5,705	of whom	5,208	are natives*
Lutherans . . .	2,240	"	2,162	" "
Church of England .	990	"	743	" "
Wesleyans . . .	183	"	142	" "
Presbyterians . . .	94	"	91	" "
Methodists . . .	11	"	11	" "
Congregationalists .	10	"	10	" "
Church of Scotland .	1	(a Eurasian)		
Total . . .	9,234		8,367	

The Church of England does not appear to great advantage in this list, but probably some of the 5,705 who are returned simply as "Protestants" belong to the S.P.G. mission. Of the Catholics, 65,745 are natives, against 8,367 native Protestants. We now compare these last figures with the results of the preceding census :—

* "Natives" are Hindus, to the exclusion of Eurasians, who, however, are a mere handful in Tanjore.

TANJORE DISTRICT.	NATIVE CHRISTIANS.	
	Catholics.	Protestants.
1871	54,884 ...	10,378
1881	65,745 ...	8,367
	<hr/>	
Increase	10,861
Decrease	2,011

From these figures it would appear that not only is the Catholic Church in possession of the field in Tanjore, and making steady progress, but that, despite the various agencies employed for so long a period, the Protestants are a small body, much divided amongst themselves, and that during the last ten years they have decreased by one-fifth of their whole number. These ten years include the period of the famous Tinnevely "harvest," but Tanjore was not a famine district, and there was no "harvest" to be reaped there. If we turn to the Reports of the S.P.G., we find some explanation of this decay of the once boasted mission of Swartz at Tanjore. The Reports we refer to are not those which are read at May meetings, and distributed here in England, but the Reports of the Madras Diocesan Committee of the Society, and especially the facts communicated to the committee by the Rev. W. H. Blake, of Tanjore. It is only of very recent years that we have these outspoken accounts of a state of things which is of by no means recent origin. This is often the way with these mission reports. Things are put in the most hopeful light until the collapse comes, and has to be explained.

In the Report for 1877-78 the Rev. A. Manuel writes from Tanjore: *—

On perusing the returns of the year, I find that the number of the congregation is less than what it was in the preceding years, and this I believe is attributable to the fact that the names of such persons as are employed in other places, and those of their families (all belonging to Tanjore), were also included in the returns prepared for those years. The present returns show only the actual number of the congregation now residing in the town. As to the state of the congregation I can say that *the members are in general earnest in their religious duties and many of them show by their lives that they have the essence of Christianity and that spiritual religion grows in them.* Besides the congregation at Tanjore, there are others in twenty-three villages, but the number of members in each is small.

We have italicised one passage, as we shall soon hear a very different story from Mr. Blake. Mr. Manuel's Report represents just the hopeful *couleur-de-rose* view which is usually kept up

* Report of the Madras Diocesan Committee, 1877-78, pp. 94, 95.

(not necessarily in bad faith) till the very last moment. The first part of his Report shows that the same men may appear twice in the mission statistics—first, in their place of origin, and, secondly, in their place of residence. In the same report the Rev. M. Gnanakam writes from Negapatam (in the Tanjore district), to complain of the difficulties caused by Lutheran emissaries from Tranquebar. "Our people," he says, "are often tempted to join them by their boarding schools and paying system." We shall presently see that the S.P.G. has itself "a paying system" of long standing in this very district of Tanjore.

Three years later we have the first admissions of failure. The Rev. W. H. Kay reports in the returns for 1880–81 a falling-off in some of the village congregations attached to Tanjore. This he attributes to an insufficient supply of pastors—a single native clergyman (Mr. Manuel) having to do the work that was formerly assigned to three missionaries and three native pastors. In the same year the Rev. M. Gnanakam again reports troubles caused by the Lutherans of Tranquebar, and repeats his complaints of the evil done by their "paying system."

The Report for the following year (1881–82) is signed by the Rev. W. H. Blake, "priest-in-charge" of Tanjore. Mr. Blake is evidently a man who looks facts in the face boldly. His Report admits at once that there has been failure rather than success, and the details he gives throw a curious light on the system employed in drawing up mission statistics:—*

The Tanjore Mission for the last few years has been gradually and steadily becoming weaker and weaker. It has, I hope and trust, this year reached its lowest ebb. Only five years ago there were four European clergy, five native clergy and one European layman, in these districts where at present there is one European missionary and one native clergyman. . . . Under these circumstances, and considering there has also been a large reduction in the number of catechists and schoolmasters employed, owing to the difficulty of procuring competent and suitable men for the work, it is not wonderful that very little progress has been made in the district, and the work remained almost stationary. And considering that we are surrounded by active vigilant Lutherans, *ever seeking what S.P.G. sheep they can ensnare and devour*, ready to take advantage of our weakness, and themselves seemingly rich in mission agents and money, it is a matter of congratulation to be able to report that, although there has been no increase, there has been no decrease, at least, in that way. There has no doubt been some falling-off in numbers when we compare the statistics given in the annual returns, statistics in some cases cannot well be compared unless you know they have been drawn up by the same person and on the same lines. I

* Madras Diocesan Committee's Report, 1881–82, pp. 95, &c.

remember learning something about this, when for the first time making out the returns for Combaconam* six years ago, when I found, to my surprise, that there were five congregations in the town of Combaconam itself, although there were not more than eight or ten families, and they all attended one church. On asking for an explanation, I was told that as they lived in different parts of the town, which was considered to be made up of five villages (or parishes, or wards, as it were), they really lived in five separate villages, and those who lived in one village properly were one village or congregation; so in Combaconam itself there were five congregations reckoned, where I only considered there was one. In the same way, every separate or straggling family in the district, not forming part of a larger body of Christians, was, *and is*, called a separate village or congregation; and as many of our Christian families are scattered about in this way, the sixty-one congregations entered in the Tanjore returns for this year and the last would dwindle down considerably if these were left out of the reckoning. I thought it better to leave it this year as it was last year, as no material change has taken place, but do not consider it a satisfactory mode of reckoning. In the same way I used to be surprised at the numbers given in the church register of the attendance at the services until I found that "souls" was taken in its literal sense, and that an attendance of twenty souls meant very often one man, two women, three or four infants in arms, and some fourteen or fifteen small children, who chiefly came to play, and ran in and out, but were useful to make up the average attendance for the year.

He goes on to say that in the Tanjore district all that remains is "the ruins of a splendid mission," and speaks of former mission stations at Amiappen, Vellum, and VEDIARPURAM, "where now not a Christian is to be found." Probably Mr. Blake means "not a Protestant," for there are Catholics to be found throughout the whole district. These mission reports, however, hardly condescend to take any notice of Catholics as such. The chief losses, he tells us, took place some twenty-five or thirty years ago, when many, on account of questions of caste, or disputes about discipline deserted to the Lutherans. Here we are reminded of what Lord Macaulay wrote home in 1835. There were other losses of the same kind at a more recent date. All these explanations, however, must fall short of the real facts. If Tanjore has lost only by defections to Lutheranism, there ought to be no decrease in the total number of Protestants in the district. Nay, there should be an increase, the result of the ordinary increase of population. But what we find in the census returns is a decrease of from 10,000 to 8,000 in ten years. This means simply that more than 2,000 souls must have either become Catholics or gone back to Paganism.

* Combaconam belongs to the Tanjore mission.

A little further on in this important Report, much light is thrown on the real source of the weakness of the once famous Tanjore mission. Its founder Swartz was a Lutheran, employed by an Anglican society at a time when it was much easier to find money than missionaries at home in England. Swartz never preached the doctrines of the Church of England, and when later on Anglican missionaries appeared in the district, they found the Lutherans too strongly in possession to be easily driven from it. Nay the old Lutheran leaven was at work in their own congregations. Thus the mission of Tanjore is divided against itself. But Swartz left another fatal legacy. The grants made to him by the Rajah Tuljaji and his successor have become the basis of "a paying system" in the S.P.G. mission, quite as real and quite as mischievous as the paying system of the Lutherans, which the S.P.G. Reports so often denounce. Let us hear Mr. Blake on this matter. We are still quoting from his Report for 1881-2.*

An unpleasant estrangement between the missionary and the congregation has unfortunately been caused this year by a contention about the right to the land outside the Church compound on which they live: this they have chosen to regard as an attempt on the part of the missionary to deprive them of their just rights, and to obtain some authority over them. As we and our predecessors here understand the matter, the land was given to Father Schwartz [*sic*] for the use of the native Christians of his congregation who came and, with his permission, settled on the land, which became quite a small and complete parish; and therefore the missionary of the place, as the representative of Father Schwartz, is the trustee of this land, and should, and has, more or less, exercised some control over the disposal of the land. We want them therefore to pay a nominal rent in acknowledgment of this right, to prevent any uncertainty in future. They, however, maintain that it was given by the Rajah by a wave of the hand, to the Christians themselves on their asking him for some land on his way to Rameswaram, and that the missionary has no control over it; and they resist any interference on his part. The leading spirits in the matter are the members of the Lutheran congregation who are living on the land, and who are afraid that they will suffer and be liable to be turned off, if it is settled that the S.P.G. missionary has any control over the land. They made an attempt to claim the land for their congregation only on the ground that their missionary was the representative and successor of Father Schwartz in this place, forgetting that though Father Schwartz was a German and Lutheran he was the missionary of an English Society in Tanjore, which Society has always had a succession of missionaries here from his time, whereas *the Lutherans here are a schismatic*

* P. 97, &c.

body only dating back from the year 1849. That attempt therefore was easily settled.

It was fortunate for the S.P.G. that their success in this dispute did not depend on the logic of their representative, Mr. Blake. The Lutherans might well have asked if schism consisted in being employed by some society other than the S.P.G. Certain it is that Lutheranism was preached in the Tanjore district a hundred years before Anglicanism; that Swartz, of whom Mr. Blake claims to be the successor, preached no other doctrine than that now preached by his fellow-countrymen and co-religionists, the Lutherans, who now oppose Mr. Blake; and that it is Anglicanism and not Lutheranism that is new to the district, Mr. Blake's Ritualism being the newest phase of all. The S.P.G. missionary now apparently holds Lutheranism to be an evil thing, and laments that S.P.G. sheep are carried off by Lutheran wolves. It is not so long since "Lutheran wolves" were receiving the S.P.G. pay, and this not merely as watch-dogs, but as "pastors" of the fold in Tanjore.

Unluckily for the mission the dispute about the lands near the church compound is not the only money difficulty with which it has had to deal. For years there has been another dispute about the lands at Shadayangal, where the tenants of the mission were in a state of chronic arrears with their rent. In 1881-82, out of seventeen tenants, five appear to have been successfully evicted, and proceedings against two more were nearly completed. Mr. Blake also got possession of nine house sites in the village, but there were still heavy arrears to be collected, and prospect of much tiresome litigation.

If it is difficult to persuade a Tanjore Christian even to pay his rent to the mission, no wonder that it is not easy to get much from him in the way of voluntary contributions. Mr. Blake, after reporting that something has been done by his flock in support of their churches, adds that "as the Christians of Tanjore have been brought up on the principle that it is the duty of the mission to support them, and supply them at least with a catechist's place when in want, to get them to do much in the way of self-support will be a work of time."

Mr. Blake again supplies the Report for 1882-83, and gives further details on many of the points touched upon in the preceding years. We hear more of the land disputes, and of the mercenary character of the native converts. He attributes the "weak and crippled state of the mission" partly to "the insufficient supply of missionaries," and partly to "the system in which the people have been brought up." This last is evidently the chief source of weakness.

In Tanjore the early missionaries had much influence with the

Rajahs, and were able to get much help for their people, and for the work; and consequently they did not require anything from the people themselves. The people have therefore always considered it the duty of the mission to help them, and do everything for them, and that it is their duty to receive. Even in Tanjore itself the answer to any requests for subscriptions for any church work has always been "why should they give when there are Swartz's funds?" They seemed to have an idea that these were inexhaustible, sufficient to cover all possible expenses for ever, and to board and educate their children free, support their poor and widows, pay for all expenses connected with the church and its services, and afford salaries for an unlimited supply of native clergy, catechists, and schoolmasters.*

Elsewhere he tells how for the first Sunday or two after his arrival at Combaconam in the Tanjore district, the poor people used to stand up in line after service, with their hands stretched out, like beggars, and they expected more on a Communion Sunday than for an ordinary service. The result of refusing to continue paying in this direct way, appears to have been a number of secessions to Lutheranism. Mr. Blake reports a conversation which he had in a village near Combaconam where all the adherents of the S.P.G. had fallen off in this way. They now said

they would like to come back to the old mission and the old church in which they had been baptized and married; but the Lutheran missionaries were very kind to them, like the old S.P.G. missionaries, and did more for them than we did now; and that they were very poor people and wanted much help, but if we would help them like the Lutherans and give them something for coming to church, and some clothes on festivals, they would be very glad at once to come back. I asked them who helped their heathen and Roman neighbours, who were in the same state as themselves, and somehow managed to give something to their priests rather than receive anything from them:† and said that if that were the Lutheran *vatham* (religion) and they were satisfied, they had better remain where they were at present.

From all this it would appear that the Lutherans, who form the largest portion of the Protestant body in Tanjore, pay their adherents openly and directly; it would seem that this was formerly also the practice in the S.P.G. mission, but that now what help is given is more indirect, the converts looking for some share in "Father Swartz's Fund" in the way of employment, occupation

* M.D.C. Report, 1882-83, p. 27.

† There is another incidental reference to the Catholics of the Tanjore district in this Report of Mr. Blake. Speaking of the village of Anthanoor he says:—"I should like to have a native clergyman stationed there. He would also be able to work in the southern part of this district, which is now quite untouched by any mission work, except of course the Romans, who are everywhere" (p. 28).

Protestant Missions in

of mission lands, and the support of their children in boarding schools.

Mr. Blake has more to tell of the curious system on which mission statistics are drawn up, and we hear once more of "congregations" made up of a single family or even of a single individual, but what we have already quoted on this subject from an earlier Report will suffice for our purpose. From another part of the Report it appears that up to the Midsummer of 1883 the land case—that is, the dispute about the settlement near the Tanjore church compound—was still unsettled. It had been carried to the High Court of Madras, and pastors and people were still waiting for a decision. There is much, too, about the actual condition of the Tanjore Protestants which we shall have to notice a little later.

We pass on to Mr. Blake's Report for the year 1883-84—the latest that we have received. The Tanjore land dispute is still going on, and Mr. Blake writes :*—

As long as the land case remains unsettled, it is difficult for the work among the congregation to go on satisfactorily and pleasantly. Any one, missionary, pastor, or catechist, who supports the claims of the mission to the land, is regarded by the congregation as antagonistic to their rights and interests. So, in matters of charity, as in subscribing to the Pastor's Endowment Fund, it is not to be expected that they will contribute freely and liberally to assist in the work of the mission, when the mission, as they think, is seeking to deprive them of their rights, and their money may be required to defend themselves against the injustice of the mission.

This year a new rule of the S.P.G. came into force, by which native congregations were to subscribe one-half of their pastor's salary, but in consideration of the peculiar circumstances of Tanjore congregations in that district were called upon to provide only one-fifth instead of one-half. But even so Mr. Blake was not very hopeful as to the amount being collected. Of two of his congregations he remarks that "these people rather expect that their pastor should spend some two or three rupees on them."† While we are dealing with financial matters, we may notice an ingenious device adopted in Tanjore in order to economize on the cost of catechists. In the words of the Report:—"To encourage the catechists in their evangelistic work a small portion of their salary is given them in tracts, and *only by persuading people to buy their tracts* they will be able to realize their full salary." This plan seems to have been adopted to meet a reduction on the grant for catechists made by the Madras Diocesan Committee. Considering that the catechists had already to pay away a certain

* Report, 1883-84, p. 17.

† P. 15.

portion of their salaries in the form of so-called "voluntary" contributions to the mission, their present position cannot be a very flourishing one.

But the probability is that, badly as these catechists are paid, they receive quite as much as they are worth. In various Reports we are told that, "with one or two exceptions, they are not qualified for evangelistic work, except among the lowest class of the population"—that the missionaries are "painfully conscious that their agents are not what they should be"—and the annual examinations of agents and candidates for the post of agent betray an ignorance of the elementary truths of Christianity that is simply astounding. When such are the teachers, what can the disciples be? Here we have something very like the blind leading the blind. We have seen what a flattering report the native pastor, Mr. Manuel, gave of the Tanjore Protestants in 1878, but our candid friend, Mr. Blake, writing in 1883, is more clear-sighted and more outspoken. Here is what he has to say of a considerable portion of his flock :†—

It may easily be understood that when Christians are so scattered and mixed up with the heathen, always being in a minority in a village, and sometimes obliged to look for wives among their heathen relatives, and where they are at the same time so poor and ignorant, belonging (with the exception of the Canendogudy and Aneycadu people and some of the Tanjore congregation) to the lowest class, and where the mission agents, the catechists, and schoolmasters, as a rule, are so inferior in intellectual attainments, as is shown by the results of the annual examinations, as well as in spiritual qualifications, as shown by the results of their work—that not much can be expected in the way of spiritual life in these district congregations. I am afraid that many, especially those who live by themselves amongst the heathen, are merely nominal Christians, and are more influenced by their heathen neighbours and surroundings than able to influence others for good.‡

One of the worst features of the Protestant community in this district, and one which gives the missionaries not a little trouble, is what Mr. Blake describes as "lax views and practice with regard to marriage." There are many cases of husbands and wives separated and living with others, while the rest of the congregation countenance the scandal, and seem to see no very

* 1883-4, p. 14.

† 1882-3, p. 29.

‡ In the same Report we hear something not quite to the credit of the still more famous Tinnevely mission—viz., "I should mention that in several places [in Tanjore district] the catechists have come accidentally upon Tinnevely Christians who have come up to those parts for work or commerce, and settled amongst the heathen, and seem to be living as heathen. I presume that such were not very good Christians at home."

great harm in the arrangement. There is also a tendency to keep up or revive pagan marriage customs, and to marry girls under age. Another point is the readiness of native Christians to marry within the forbidden degrees. This last failing is a source of peculiar anxiety to the chief pastor of Tanjore.

In this matter [he writes] former missionaries do not appear to have been very strict. What has been done by a missionary the people consider can be, and ought to be, done by a missionary if they wish it, especially as it is still done by Lutherans on one side, and by Romans on the other. It is difficult to get them to understand that, as members of the Church, and connected with the English Communion, they are placed in a disadvantageous position: that the Church of England, unlike the Lutherans, accepts the laws of the Catholic Church, but does not, like the Romans, accept a dispensing power in such matters. In one village in those districts, where we have a large congregation, and where is also a large Lutheran congregation of schismatics, the Lutheran pastor is married to his deceased wife's sister, who left and has been divorced from her own husband.

It must indeed be difficult for Mr. Blake to make his flock understand this curious theory of their "disadvantageous position" in reference to the impediment of consanguinity. But facts like the last quoted show to what a scandalous extent the Christian law of marriage is disregarded in the Tanjore mission. It is quite evident from Mr. Blake's reports that he is making a very determined stand against this disgraceful state of things, and he believes that there is already some improvement. The great difficulty, however, is that the Lutherans permit a strange laxity in this respect, and a remonstrance on the subject from the Anglican missionary may end in a whole family going off to the Lutheran pastor.

A further difficulty arises from mixed marriages, not merely marriages with the Lutheran "schismatics," but marriages with pagans. It seems that the Tanjore missionaries formerly encouraged this kind of marriage in the case of their young men, recommending them to take a pagan wife and convert her. Indeed it must often be by no means easy to avoid such marriages, where the converts are a small and scattered flock; but to tolerate what is unavoidable is a very different thing from encouraging a practice as a means of evangelisation. Mr. Blake holds that these pagan marriages could and should be avoided, and he sees in them the source of many of the calamities of the mission.

Here indeed [he says]* is the explanation of a good deal that is unsatisfactory in the Christianity of Tanjore Christians. They have

* 1883-4, p. 17.

never come out from among their heathen connections ; rather have strengthened and kept these up by this custom, recommended, I am told, by the old missionaries, to “convert” a girl, of course one of their own relatives, and marry her. This, of course, means a heathen mother-in-law, and a heathen mother-in-law means more or less of heathen ceremonies introduced into the house in connection with important family events, and a corresponding combination in the religious education of the children.

No wonder that under these circumstances there are so many merely nominal Christians to be found in the Tanjore congregations, and that one hears occasionally of a whole village, with the exception of one or two families, relapsing into paganism.

To sum up—the Tanjore mission may be said to be that in which Indian Protestantism has been longest on its trial. There, for more than century, the Gospel of the Reformation has been preached. The founder of the mission was a man of exceptional gifts, and singularly high character. He enjoyed the favour both of the native rajahs and the English rulers of the district, and he was able from the very outset to secure valuable grants for the endowment of the native church. What is the result of all this after a single century—not growth, but decay. We have a body of Protestants, divided among several sects, and rapidly diminishing in numbers. Many of them avowedly are Christians only from mercenary motives. Their fathers have lived upon the mission funds, and, despite the protests of the present missionaries, they claim the right to do the same, and there is a Tanjore land question in which the rival parties are the pastors and the people. In ten years one native Protestant in every five has disappeared from the rolls of the mission. Of those that are left many have changed from one sect to another, to escape from a more rigid to a more lax moral discipline. Most of them are very ignorant, the catechists in many instances as ignorant as the people ; and there is widespread immorality, a loose theory and practice in regard to marriage, and a pagan element in the family life of many nominally Christian households. It is the ruin of a mission that was once appealed to as a standing proof of the missionary power of Protestantism. These are the fruits of the labours of a century. “By their fruits you shall know them.” Does it look as if the blessing of God is on the Protestant missions of Tanjore ?

To read the Reports that are published each May in England by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel no one would suspect that this was the state of things in Tanjore. There is usually a word or two about the ordination of a native pastor, or some other satisfactory incident, and that is all. In the last Report published, that for 1885 (issued May 1886) we read :—

The Tanjore circle of missions is one the Report of which is turned to by many with great interest, partly because of the connection of Tanjore with the Society's early missions, and partly because of the energetic and devotional character of the work carried on by the Rev. W. H. Blake and his assistants.

Then comes some news about the Tanjore College, and an account of some ordinations. The facts we have given in this article are derived partly from the Census Returns, partly from the Annual Reports of the Madras Diocesan Committee of the S.P.G. These Reports are not very easy to obtain even in India by the general public,* and in England they are very seldom seen. The series of the S.P.G. May Reports for some fifty years is to be found complete in the British Museum. So far as we can ascertain, the Madras Diocesan Reports are represented there by a very imperfect series which ceases abruptly in 1862. A few extracts from Mr. Blake's Reports might be included with advantage in the little volume that is annually laid before the May meetings. Mr. Blake is clearly an honest, energetic man, who will not send in the usual doubtful statistics, and who will not say peace where there is no peace. The strange thing is that these frank statements have only appeared of recent years, and the evil is of very old standing. We have seen how, as late as 1878, the native pastor Manuel used smooth phrases to keep up appearances in his Report. One wonders how some other Indian missions would look if a plain-spoken man like Mr. Blake were allowed to report on them. Unfortunately, such reports seldom see the light until the evil is becoming notorious, and must be explained rather than concealed. The mission of Tanjore has lived too long on the fame of its founder Swartz. The truth about it has already been spoken in India ; it is time that it should be spoken also in England.

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE.

* They are not published; and cannot be had from the booksellers. They have a kind of domestic or private circulation. A few copies are sent to England to the head-quarters of the S.P.G.

ART. III.—THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION IN THEORY
AND IN PRACTICE.

1. *The English Constitution.* By WALTER BAGEHOT. Fourth Edition. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.
2. *Popular Government.* By Sir H. S. MAINE. London: J. Murray. 1885.
3. *The English Parliament in its Transformations through a Thousand Years.* By Dr. R. GNEIST. Translated by R. JENERY SHEE. London: Grevel & Co. 1886.
4. *The Constitutional History of England (1760–1860).* By Sir THOMAS ERSKINE MAY. Sixth Edition. London: Longmans & Co. 1878.
5. *English Constitutional History.* By T. P. TASWELL-LANGMEAD. Second Edition. London: Stevens & Haynes. 1880.

THE recent discussions on Federation and the government of Ireland have turned men's attention to the study of the English Constitution. Those who approach these questions dispassionately and with no view to party purposes, see at once the necessity of an accurate knowledge of the system which these proposals are intended to modify. Yet no one can wade through the flood of literature and oratory on these subjects without perceiving how few of the writers and speakers really understood what they attacked or defended. There is indeed some excuse for this ignorance. Most English institutions are hard to understand. They have not come forth ready-made from the brains of political philosophers. They are the growth of ages. They are cumbersome and defective, and they bear about them the marks of their barbaric origin. But the English Constitution—the boast of every Englishman, the envy of every foreigner—has the additional difficulty of being a gigantic sham. “The Queen's Government” is such only in the sense that it governs the Queen. “Her Majesty's Ministers” are Her Majesty's masters. “The Queen's Speech” is seldom spoken and never written by her. Our law-books recognize no such person as the “Prime Minister,” and no such council as the “Cabinet.” In short, the English Constitution is one thing in theory and quite another thing in practice.

The Theory of the English Constitution has been set forth in a masterly fashion by Montesquieu, in a famous chapter of his “*Esprit des Lois*” (liv. xi. c. 6). The powers of government, he

says, are threefold, Legislative, Executive, and Judicial. By the first the prince or magistrate makes new laws, and corrects or repeals existing laws. By the second he makes peace and war, sends and receives embassies, and establishes public security. By the third he punishes crimes, and decides the dissensions of individuals. When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or body of persons there is no liberty, because tyrannical laws can be carried out tyrannically. So, too, there is no liberty when the judicial power is not separated from the legislative and executive. All is lost if the same man, or the same body of princes, nobles, or people, exercises all three powers. In other words, liberty depends on the separation of the three powers, and not on the form of government, whether it be monarchy, oligarchy, aristocracy, or democracy. The English Constitution entrusts these powers to three distinct bodies, and is therefore free. And now I had better continue in the words of Blackstone, who has to some extent followed Montesquieu.

As with us the executive power of the laws is lodged in a single person (the King), they have all the advantages of strength and dispatch, that are to be found in the most absolute monarchy; and as the legislature of the kingdom is entrusted to three distinct powers, entirely independent of each other: first, the sovereign; secondly, the lords spiritual and temporal, which is an aristocratical assembly of persons selected for their piety, their birth, their wisdom, their valour or their property; and thirdly, the House of Commons, freely chosen by the people from among themselves, which makes it a kind of democracy: as this aggregate body, actuated by different springs and attentive to different interests, composes the British Parliament and has the supreme disposal of everything, there can no inconvenience be attempted by either of three branches, but will be withstood by one of the other two; each branch being armed with a negative power, sufficient to repel any innovation which it shall think inexpedient or dangerous. . . . If the supreme power were lodged in any one of the three branches separately, we must be exposed to the inconveniences of either absolute monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy. . . . But the constitutional government of this island is so admirably tempered and compounded, that nothing can endanger or hurt it but destroying the equilibrium of power between one branch of the legislature and the rest. *For if ever it should happen that the independence of any one of the three should be lost, or that it should become subservient to the views of either of the other two, there would soon be an end of our Constitution.** [The italics are mine.]

* "Commentaries on the Laws of England," Introduction, section ii. Blackstone considers the administration of justice to be part of the executive. "And as by our excellent constitution the sole executive power of the laws is vested in the Sovereign, it will follow that all courts

According to Montesquieu and Blackstone, then, the excellence of the English Constitution consists (1) in the separation of the powers of government, and (2) in the co-ordination (not subordination) of the three elements of the legislative. Tacitus had said that a mixed government could not be permanent. Blackstone triumphantly answers:—"The British Constitution has long remained (and may it long continue) a standing exception to the truth of this observation." And Montesquieu: "Ce beau système a été trouvé dans les bois" among those very Germans whose manners and customs Tacitus has so accurately described.

Our constitutional terminology fits in exactly with this theory. So, too, does the ceremony of procedure. The Queen still opens Parliament with all the pomp handed down from the days of the Plantagenets. Her throne is erected in that Upper House which alone she deigns to visit. When she is seated, her faithful Commons are summoned to attend. A stampede is heard, and then a crowd of puffing commoners, clad in every-day garb, comes rushing into the brilliant assembly of princes and peers. But they are not permitted to proceed far. They are obliged to remain standing at the end of the chamber while Her Majesty reads her gracious speech. She informs her hearers of the state of the country, and of her relations with the different foreign powers. The Commons are then specially thanked for the liberality of their supplies in the past, and are asked for further contributions. Lastly, she enumerates the chief legislative proposals to be laid before both Houses.* The Commons then retire to the plain green benches of their own House and discuss what answer they shall make to her Majesty's requests. The process of legislation is also in accordance with the theory of the Constitution. No Bill can become law until it has passed

of justice (which are the medium by which he administers the laws) are derived from the power of the Crown. . . . In all the courts the Sovereign is supposed, in contemplation of law, to be always present; but as that is in fact impossible, he is there represented by his judges, whose power is only an emanation of the royal prerogative" (*Ibid.* book iii. chap. iii.). The Plantagenet kings and even queens often presided in the law-courts and decided cases. James I. sat personally in court and attempted to interfere, but was silenced by Lord Chief Justice Coke. There is, however, very little difference between Blackstone's and Montesquieu's views. The connection between the executive and the judicial powers had (with some important exceptions) so long been practically obsolete that Montesquieu might fairly maintain that the spirit of the English Constitution required their separation.

* This last portion of the Queen's Speech is somewhat anomalous. It is a sign of the junction of the legislative and executive powers which will be mentioned further on.

both Houses and has received the assent of the Sovereign. Moreover, if any one offends against the law, he is said to break the Queen's peace. If he joins the Army or Navy he enters the service of the Queen. The officers of State are her Majesty's Ministers. She sends her ambassadors to every Court, and appoints consuls in the great seaports. It is she who declares war and makes peace. But all these ceremonies and modes of speech represent a state of things which no longer exists. The ancient forms survive although their spirit has departed. The intelligent foreigner who gazes with admiration at the splendid pageant of the opening of Parliament little dreams that the plainly dressed men huddled together below the bar are the representatives of an assembly which rules the Queen, the Lords, and the mighty British Empire.

For the practice of the Constitution is in flat contradiction to the theory. In theory, the legislative and executive are separated—in practice, they are joined together. In theory, the three branches of the legislature are equal—in practice, one is supreme. The youngest branch, the House of Commons, has outgrown the other two. It possesses overwhelming influence in legislation, and it has acquired the whole executive power. But the House is too big to wield its powers directly. It therefore entrusts them to a select committee—the Cabinet, the chairman of which is the Prime Minister. This personage is unknown to the theory of the Constitution. His name implies that he is the chief servant of the Queen: in reality he is the President of the British Republic. He is chosen by the people by a roundabout process. When the general elections take place there are usually two parties before the country with rival programmes and rival chiefs. The electors, in voting for the different candidates, are really voting for one or other of the rival programmes and chiefs. Thus in 1880 the choice lay between "Beaconsfield and Imperialism" and "Gladstone and Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform." When the House meets there is, of course, no formal election of a Prime Minister. But it is understood that there is some one man whom the majority of the House look up to as their leader.* Her Majesty is then "pleased" to summon him to her councils and to entrust to him the formation of a Ministry. Accordingly he chooses a number of persons, usually members of one or other House, and distributes the various offices among them. Of these Ministers a certain number, about fourteen or fifteen, are summoned to

* He need not necessarily be a member of the House of Commons, but he must have the confidence and support of a majority of that House.

seats in the Cabinet. The late Mr. Bagehot* has given an admirable description of this mysterious institution:—

The Cabinet, in a word, is a board of control chosen by the Legislature, out of persons whom it trusts and knows, to rule the nation. The particular mode in which the English Ministers are selected, the fiction that they are in any political sense the Queen's servants, the rule which limits the choice of the Cabinet to the members of the Legislature—are accidents unessential to its definition—historical incidents separable from its nature. Its characteristic is that it should be chosen by the Legislature out of persons agreeable to and trusted by the Legislature. . . . A Cabinet is a combining committee—a *hyphen* which joins, a *buckle* which fastens, the legislative part of the State to the executive part of the State. In its origin it belongs to the one, in its functions it belongs to the other.

Practically, then, the royal authority is in commission. We still have a Sovereign, but she reigns and does not govern. Her power has passed to the Prime Minister and his Cabinet. They compose the Queen's speech. They make war and peace. They arrange the amount of the revenue, and the manner of collecting and spending it. They draw up the list of Bills to be proposed to the Houses. The Queen's ambassadors are really the ambassadors of the Cabinet, and the army and navy are its servants. Everything is of course carried on in the Queen's name, but, as Mr. Bagehot says, she is only the *dignified* part of the Government—the *efficient* part is the Cabinet.

The relations between the House of Commons and the Cabinet are very peculiar. Theoretically, the House is a merely legislative assembly. Practically, it is an assembly which elects the executive. But it still keeps a check on its most famous select committee. An adverse vote can dissolve the Cabinet and dethrone the Prime Minister. He, in his turn, can dissolve the House and appeal to the nation. Thus in the present year (1886) the vote on Mr. Collings' amendment dissolved the Salisbury Cabinet; but when the Home Rule Bill was rejected Mr. Gladstone dissolved the House and appealed to the country. These relations between the House of Commons and the Cabinet enable us to understand certain anomalies in the working of the Constitution. The rejection of a Government Bill does not in itself imply any want of confidence in the foreign policy of the Govern-

* "The English Constitution," 4th ed. pp. 13-14. I must here, once for all, acknowledge my great obligation to this excellent work. The writer had a happy facility of hitting off epigrammatic expressions easily understood and easily remembered. In his power of seeing through fictions he rivalled Bentham, but in his admiration for them he almost equalled Blackstone.

ment, nor does a vote of censure on the foreign policy in itself imply a disposition to reject the Government Bills. Nevertheless, the Russians may pour into India because a Ministry has been defeated on a Bill to provide the agricultural labourer with three acres and a cow. Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, by opposing Mr. Gladstone's legislative proposals, have brought into power Lord Salisbury, whose executive policy they abhor.

The House of Lords has fallen from its high estate. It has ceased to be a co-ordinate branch of the legislature, and is now merely a drag on the Ministerial coach—useful when the course is downhill, but otherwise mischievous. Whenever the nation is in earnest, this obstacle is overcome, but it is not often that the nation is in earnest, and consequently the power of the Lords is not to be despised. By rejecting legislative proposals, they have upset many a Ministry, and have thereby exercised control over the executive. This control, however, is only indirect. A Government backed by a majority of the Commons can laugh at votes of want of confidence passed by the Lords. Mr. Gladstone's foreign policy was censured over and over again by the Upper House, but this made no difference in his tenure of power. It may be objected that the present head of the executive is a peer. This is merely an accident. He is Prime Minister not because he has the support of the house in which he sits, but because he has the support of the Commons.

While we are enumerating the different parts of the Constitution, we must not forget to mention the Queen. It is true, indeed, that she is no longer the executive, and that her veto on legislation is obsolete. Still, it would be a great mistake to consider her merely as an expensive ornament. She is most useful—not so much in her *person* as in her *dignity*. People sometimes complain that she does nothing. The answer is, that she does exactly what she is wanted to do—she exists. What enormous power accrues to the Prime Minister and his Cabinet from the fiction that they are the servants of the Queen, carrying on her Majesty's Government according to her Majesty's wishes! What would become of the army and navy if they found out that they were in the service, not of "our Sovereign lady the Queen," but of William Ewart Gladstone? Would our soldiers pour out their blood in his name? Would our sailors brave the perils of the deep for his honour and glory? Where would the Established Church be without its head? What should we do without that convenient epithet "disloyal" when speaking of the inhabitants of a neighbouring dependency? Nor must it be forgotten that the Sovereign in person may sometimes exert great influence. The Queen on a famous occasion put down the mighty Palmerston, and is said to have

induced Lord Salisbury to withdraw his opposition to the late Reform Bill. Indeed, there is no knowing how powerful a popular Sovereign might become. A William III., an Elizabeth, or even a George III. might recover some of the ancient prerogatives, and might once again not only reign, but also rule. Meantime, we may assert that the theory and practice of the English Constitution are utterly at variance. The separation of the functions of Government which called forth the praises of Montesquieu no longer exists. The changes dreaded by Blackstone have come to pass. "The equilibrium of power between one branch of the legislature and the rest" has been destroyed. The independence of two of the branches has been lost, and they have become subservient to the views of that branch which was the lowest. We can now only expect that there will "soon be an end of our Constitution."

Hitherto, I have been merely describing the theory and practice of the Constitution. We cannot, however, thoroughly understand the latter without studying the process by which it has been brought about. The English Constitution is not a machine, but an organism. It has not been made; it has grown. We must, therefore, proceed according to the historical and comparative methods which are followed in the study of organic beings. There will be no lack of "specimens." The seeds of the Constitution have been sown in many distant lands, and have sprung up and flourished with varying fortunes.

The latest written laws of the Constitution are the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement. In these may be found the theory which is expounded in our law-books. And it may be affirmed that in the reign of William III. the practice of the Constitution was fairly in agreement with the theory. The king was the executive. He was his own Prime Minister and Commander-in-chief. He had, indeed, a Council of Ministers, but they were, as their name implied, his servants, not his masters. He was also the real head of the legislature. The Bill for Triennial Parliaments and the Place Bill were vetoed by him after they had been passed by the two Houses. The Lords were really a co-ordinate branch of the legislature. The Commons were not an executive body. They even tried to exclude the Ministers from their House by the Place Bill just mentioned, and at length succeeded in inserting a clause to that effect in the Act of Settlement.* During the reign of Anne the theory and

* "That no person who has an office or place of profit under the King, or receives a pension from the Crown, shall be capable of serving as a Member of the House of Commons." 12 & 13 Will. III. c. 2, s. 3; repealed by 4 & 5 Anne, c. 20, s. 28.

practice continued to agree. The Queen presided in person at the Councils of her Ministers, and exercised the veto on legislation. But at the accession of the House of Hanover a vast change took place. The new king owed his crown to the party which was unfavourable to the influence of the throne, and he was opposed by the party which was favourable to that influence. He was therefore compelled to allow the royal authority to be shorn of its former power. In truth the loss caused him little regret. England was to him merely an appendage to his beloved Hanover. His English Ministers supplied him with a revenue which seemed boundless wealth, but they could not expect him to take any interest in their discussions, especially as he did not understand the language in which they were carried on. Consequently, the councils were held without the king's presence, and this has ever since been the practice of the Constitution. "The presence of the king at the Cabinet," says a high authority (Mr. Gladstone: "Gleanings of Past Years," i. 85) "either means personal government—that is to say, the reservation to him of all final decisions which he may think fit to appropriate—or else the forfeiture of dignity by his entering upon equal terms into the arena of general, searching, and sometimes warm discussion." His absence, however, means that he will have no part in the government of the country. The real successor of Anne was not George I., but Robert Walpole.

It would not be possible within the compass of this article to give an adequate account of the origin and growth of the Cabinet Council.* A short sketch will suffice for our present purpose. A council of some sort is a necessary part of every organized government. A single ruler is not enough to carry on the business of a country, and the people are too many. A small body of managers must therefore be appointed. When the King is their master, the government is a monarchy. When they are the servants of the people, the government is either an aristocracy or democracy. But when the managers are their own masters, there is an oligarchy. Before the Great Rebellion the government of England was sometimes monarchical, sometimes oligarchical, according to the character of the King and the Council, and sometimes almost aristocratical. The "Concilium Ordinarium" of the Plantagenets was a sort of permanent committee of the "Magnum Concilium," sitting for the despatch of executive, and sometimes also of judicial business. When the "Magnum Concilium"

* The subject may be studied in Mr. Dicey's *Arnold Prize Essay*, and in Professor Gneist's "English Parliament." The latter work may also be recommended for its treatment of the relation between early English and early German institutions, and above all for its account of the origin of Parliament.

became the Parliament, the "Concilium Ordinarium" lost its connexion with the legislative body, and become more united to the King, at one time as his servant, at another as his master. As might be expected, there soon arose a council within the Council, to which the King entrusted the more important and confidential affairs of State. This inner council was known as the Privy Council, and gradually acquired the control of the whole of the executive. During the reign of Charles II. a council was chosen by him within this inner council and was styled the "Cabinet." It was thus a committee of the Privy Council, selected by the Sovereign. Such it still is in theory. Its connection with the legislature is due to the Sovereign's desire to control the legislature by means of her servants, and also to the accidental circumstances at the time of the Hanoverian succession. Parliament had elected the King, and the King naturally chose his Ministers from Parliament.

The accession of George II. made no change in the Government. Walpole continued for nearly twenty years longer to rule the country, and when he fell it was because he had lost the confidence of Parliament. George III. struggled hard to win back the power that had been lost by his two predecessors, and indeed succeeded for some time. During the administration of Lord North, the King was the real Prime Minister. But the King's mismanagement and the folly of the Whigs only led to the dictatorship of the younger Pitt.

From the accession of the Hanoverian dynasty till the Reform Bill of 1832, a period of more than one hundred years, the English Constitution was mainly aristocratical. The House of Lords had considerable power, but the lords themselves had much more. A peer had only one vote in his own House, but he sometimes had half a dozen votes in the House of Commons. He was therefore not opposed to the growing power of the lower House. But when it was proposed to abolish the rotten boroughs and extend the franchise, he knew that his power was doomed. No Bill was ever sent up to the Lords which was more disliked by them. Had their House been really a co-ordinate branch of the legislature the Bill would never have passed. When they withdrew their opposition, they not merely consented to this particular measure, but they publicly admitted their inability to resist the determined demands of the Commons. Thus the lords have met with the same fate as the king. Both have been eliminated from the practical government of the country, which has now become a democracy under the guise of a monarchy.

The present condition of the Constitution will be better understood if we now compare it with the numerous copies of it.

The sturdy English colonists, Catholic and Puritan, fleeing from persecution, carried with them to their new home not only their little stores of household goods, but a treasure of great price. Wherever they went, their laws and their constitution accompanied them. Governments were set up, modelled after that which they had left behind. The Governor represented the Crown. He and his Ministers were the executive. The legislature was composed of the Governor and two Houses, the upper House appointed by him, and the lower House elected by the people. The history of the colonial constitutions is the history of the English constitution in miniature. The governors tried to give laws to the little senates. The upper Houses mimicked the state of their prototype, and the lower Houses rivalled the Commons in independence. Indeed, the loss of the American colonies was due to their assertion of a cherished English right. Rather than submit to taxation without representation, they broke away from the mother-country, and declared themselves independent. And now comes a matter of the greatest interest to the student of the English Constitution. The colonies in severing their connection with England had thereby broken the bond of union among themselves. It was, therefore, necessary to form a government to bring them together again. The English Constitution was their model. They had rebelled, we must remember, not so much against the Constitution as against King George and his Ministers. Besides, their local governments had been copied from it. Their great aim was to retain as much as possible of the spirit of the English Constitution, but to provide against a tyranny like that of George III. They took their ideas from Montesquieu and from the working of the Constitution during the Ministry of Lord North. Accordingly, they were careful to separate the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, and to form two legislative chambers, the Senate and House of Representatives. The president was to stand in the place of the English king. He was to have a qualified veto on legislation, and in him was to be the chief executive power. As a security, however, against abuse, his office was to be elective, and for a term of only four years. He was to appoint his Ministers (by and with the advice and consent of the Senate), and it was distinctly enacted that no member of the executive should be a member of the legislature.* And to make the

* "No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office, under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased, during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office." Art. I. sec. vi. 2. Compare the similar provision in the Act of Settlement, *supra*.

distinction more marked, the President was to be elected by a process quite different from that by which the Legislature was to be elected. Stringent conditions were required for any change in the Constitution, and consequently few changes have taken place.*

After the loss of the American colonies a new period of colonial history was entered upon. The colonies were henceforth to be nominally free, but really governed from Downing Street. Representative institutions were granted in 1785 to New Brunswick, in 1791 to the two Canadas, and later on to the Australian colonies. But the assemblies were controlled by the governors and the official aristocracy, who were the nominees and allies of the Home Government. Occasionally also the English ministers directly interfered. The rapid growth of the colonies and the Reform Bill of 1832 put an end to this system. A rebellion in Lower Canada brought matters to a crisis. Responsible government was introduced and has since become the rule in other free colonies. "By the adoption of this principle," says Sir Erskine May (*"Constitutional History of England,"* vol. iii. p. 368),

a colonial constitution has become the very image and reflection of parliamentary government in England. The governor, like the Sovereign whom he represents, holds himself aloof from, and superior to parties; and governs through constitutional advisers who have acquired an ascendancy in the legislature. He leaves contending parties to fight out their own battles; and by admitting the stronger party to his councils, brings the executive authority into harmony with popular sentiments. And as the recognition of this doctrine, in England, has practically transferred the supreme authority of the State from the Crown to Parliament and the people—so in the colonies has it wrested from the governor and from the parent State the direction of colonial affairs. And again, as the Crown has gained in ease and popularity what it has lost in power—so has the mother country, in accepting, to the full, the principle of local self-government, established the closest relations of amity and confidence between herself and her colonies.†

This short account of the English Constitution since the

* "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments; which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress." Art. V.

† As Sir Charles Gavan Duffy has said: "Canada did not obtain Home Rule because she was loyal, but she became loyal because she obtained Home Rule."

Revolution, and of the American and Colonial constitutions which were copied from it, leads us to a startling result. Most Englishmen of the present day look upon the American constitution as something altogether mysterious. They do not understand "Congress" and "caucuses," "tickets" and "platforms," "Democrats" and "Republicans." Part of the difficulty arises, no doubt, from the peculiar phraseology of American politics. Part also from the division of parties on the question of State rights. But the difficulty is due chiefly to the fact that a great change has taken place here at home. Fifty years ago Radical reformers used to be reproached with trying to "Americanize our institutions." The true Tory was known by his hearty distrust of everything "Yankee." Radicals and Tories have since changed places. To study the France of the *ancien régime* we must go to Lower Canada. In like manner we must cross over to New England to find the old English Constitution.

It is no part of my intention to discuss the comparative merits of the old and the new systems. Blackstone and Sir H. S. Maine may be consulted in favour of the old system and its American imitation, while Mr. Bagehot should be read in favour of the new. I have already alluded to some of the difficulties of the fusion of the legislative and executive powers. On the other hand the separation of these powers may produce a deadlock in the business of Government. When the executive and the legislature quarrel, or are not on good terms, the legislature will not grant what is required by the executive for carrying on the Government, and the executive will refuse to exercise powers entrusted to it. The struggle between President Johnson and the Congress after the Civil War deserves the closest attention of every student of political pathology.

At the beginning of this article it was remarked that the questions of Federation and Home Rule were drawing attention to the study of the English Constitution. I trust that what has here been said will be of help towards the right understanding of the real points at issue. Home Rule has been defined by Professor Dicey in his recent powerful work on the subject ("England's Case against Home Rule") as "the creation of an Irish Parliament which shall have legislative authority in matters of Irish concern, and of an Irish executive responsible (in general) for its acts to the Irish Parliament or the Irish people." That is to say, Ireland would stand exactly in the position of a Colony as above described. She would be just as much a part of the Empire as Canada is now. No "fundamental law of the Constitution" would be repealed. The theory and practice of the Constitution would still remain as at present. The area over which the English Parliament exercises direct control would indeed be

smaller than at present, but, in return, a number of questions which cut across the division of English parties would be got rid of, and a hundred obstructive members would be removed. Surely a change of this kind does not deserve the torrent of abuse that has been poured upon it. Strange to say, the other question, Federation, does involve vast changes in the Constitution, and yet is considered worthy of all praise. Federation requires that a distinction can be drawn between Imperial and non-Imperial matters. The Imperial Parliament should discuss Imperial questions, while non-Imperial questions should be discussed in the local Parliaments. When the legislative and executive powers are separated, this distinction can be drawn; but when they are united, every Imperial question becomes domestic, and every domestic question Imperial. Federation thus involves that the present practice of the Constitution should be completely changed. I do not mean to imply that this would be a change for the worse. I only wish to point out that whereas Home Rule is decried because it involves a vast change in the Constitution (which it does not), Federation, which does imply such a change, is lauded to the skies. Something, however, will have to be done. The state of the East may at any time lead to a war. England's difficulty will be Ireland's opportunity. Canada and New South Wales will rightly object to being dragged into war without being consulted. Federation or dismemberment must therefore come. Federation means prosperity, dismemberment means destruction. We shall soon be called upon to decide whether the New Zealander of the future is to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's from a broken arch of London Bridge, or to take his seat at Westminster in a senate representing the four quarters of the globe.

T. B. SCANNELL.

ART. IV.—SHAKESPEARE AS AN ECONOMIST.

LITERATURE in these days for not a few has taken the place of religion; the heroes of literature receive a worship, which is in no way daunted by their moral shortcomings; and, if we wish to recommend our opinions among our cultured fellow-countrymen, it is no longer any use to seek "confirmations strong" in any "proofs of holy writ," for they have delivered up the Bible to the German critics, and we must rather have ready at hand some text out of the new gospel, and back our opinion by an apt quotation from Victor Hugo or Goethe. But

these are not the only names that can act as a spell to attract modern ears; and, at least for the English speaking world, the first place in all literature is still held by Shakespeare. Now this is fortunate; for in almost all points of religion and ethics, of politics and economics, on which Shakespeare touches—and he touches on many—he is an authority on the right side. True, indeed, that because Shakespeare, or Shelley, or Mr. Swinburne say a thing is so, this does not make it so; and the teachers of logic may shake their heads over a generation which refuses the rational belief in the Law of Nature, or in revealed religion, and then tries to make up for this irrational scepticism by an equally irrational belief in the poets, as though they were the inspired prophets of the Most High. Still the world never seems to have been very wise, and we must take it as we find it. The great point is to get Christian doctrine accepted, and to despise no lawful vehicle for conveying it. There was a time when, to be listened to, you had to write in Ciceronian Latin, and adorn your pages with classical quotations. That fancy is over, and now it is the turn of modern literature. Let us humour our patient, and give him nourishment in the form he can take it. For this purpose it seems to me that Shakespeare can be of great use to us, more perhaps than any other writer, because his name is so great and his teaching so clear. Let me say, indeed, at once, that I by no means subscribe to that fantastic opinion, which has exposed us to much ridicule, and which represents Shakespeare as an heroic confessor of our holy faith in the dark days of persecution. This opinion is, indeed, less preposterous than that which represents him as a sort of champion of Protestantism, or that which makes him supremely indifferent to all creeds. Still, an opinion is not right because it is not so wrong as others; and the real state of the case seems briefly this.* First, it is highly improbable that Shakespeare lived openly and avowedly as a Catholic. Secondly, there is no evidence that he was not always in heart and desire a Catholic. Thirdly, there is some, though not conclusive, evidence that he died avowedly a Catholic. Fourthly, his writings prove that he had an intimate knowledge of our religion and a great respect and liking for it; presenting over and over again the doctrines and ministers of our Church in a favourable light, when there was every occasion for doing the reverse, and, what is more to our present purpose, habitually assuming as true the Christian scheme of the universe, the Christian view of man's nature and destiny. It is not surprising,

* I can refer to the excellent article by Mr. Thurston, on "The Religion of Shakspeare," in the *Month*, May 1882.

then, that when he comes across those special departments of human action which are the field of economics—when he comes, for example, to family life, to the relations of master and servant, working classes and directing classes, buying and borrowing, contracts and ownership, poverty and accumulation—he appears in the character of a Christian economist.

In this article I propose to pluck a few flowers out of the fair garden of his writings, so as to illustrate the chief of his economical doctrines. Let us begin with the family, and with the relations of parents and children.

Obedience to parents and reverence for their old age are set forth by Shakespeare as fundamental principles of ethics and of social life, and their failure portends some catastrophe. When Timon, without the walls of Athens, curses the city, the breaking of the family forms a conspicuous part of those terrible imprecations :

*Obedience fail in children ! slaves and fools,
Pluck the grave wrinkled senate from the bench,
And minister in their steads !*

. . . . bound servants, steal !

. . . . son of sixteen,

*Pluck the lin'd crutch from thy old limping sire,
With it beat out his brains ! piety, and fear,
Religion to the gods, peace, justice, truth,
Domestic awe, night-rest, and neighbourhood,
Instruction, manners, mysteries, and trades,
Degrees, observances, customs, and laws,
Decline to your confounding contraries,
And let confusion live !*

"Timon of Athens," iv. 1.

In another play these curses on family life are displayed at work, namely, in the tragedy of "King Lear," which is a sort of commentary on the Fourth Commandment, and a picture of what happens when we have once entered on the path of insolence and disobedience. Honour and obey your parents, though they be feeble and old, or even passionate and foolish, is the moral continually borne in on us through the course of that appalling tragedy. Nothing indeed is easier than to argue against this, as against other fundamental principles of religion and morals, to reject appeals to "the offices of nature, bond of childhood," as begging the question, to adduce a dozen reasons for having our own way, to say :

This policy, and reverence of age, makes the world bitter to the best of our times ; keeps our fortunes from us, till our oldness cannot relish them. I begin to find an idle and fond bondage in the oppres-

sion of aged tyranny ; who sways, not as it hath power, but as it is suffered.—“*King Lear*,” i. 2.

This has a plausible sound, but yet, to get a mouth to utter it, Shakespeare creates an unnatural and shameless villain. And who is it but Goneril that says :

Now, by my life,
Old fools are babes again ; and must be used
With checks.—i. 3.

Now Goneril and Regan are unlike reality, unlike his other characters : they are simply two fiends. But this is a master-stroke of the great dramatist’s art and teaching ; he refuses to be natural in dealing with such an unnatural vice, and in this way undutiful children are held up to our utmost abhorrence. How different the treatment of a somewhat similar theme by George Eliot. In “*Romola*,” the hero Tito, whose deeds are like those of Edmund, Goneril, and Regan, is no inhuman fiend, but so life-like and natural that we are moved to pity and to sympathy, and begin to feel that we could have scarce helped doing the same, if we had been in his place. But, for all this, “*Romola*” is an untrue picture of life, and teaches untruth, the denial of free will, of the moral law, of judgment to come. Whereas “*King Lear*,” like the rest of Shakespeare’s dramas, and like all healthy literature in every tongue, takes for granted these fundamental truths. He knew also the weakness of man’s nature, and how, when he has once entered on the path of wickedness, he cannot stop as he pleases, and put a convenient limit to his vices.

O Goneril !

. . . . I fear your disposition :

That nature which contemns its origin,
Cannot be border’d certain in itself ;
She that herself will sliver [break off] and disbranch
From her material sap, perforce must wither
And come to deadly use.—“*King Lear*,” iv. 2.

These are the words of Albany, her husband, and he was right in his fears. For his wife, as well as Regan and Edmund, having broken the great commandment of domestic life, and stood up

As if a man were author of himself,
And knew no other kin (“*Coriolanus*,” v. 3),

were not likely to let any other commandment stand in their way, wherever their passions might drive them. But Shakespeare does not excuse this downward course, or make us sympathize with guilt. In this very play of “*King Lear*” he makes the barefaced Edmund, when alone, laugh at man’s vain excuses :

This is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in

fortune (often the surfeit of our own behaviour), we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and stars: as if we were villains on necessity; fools, by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves, and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars, and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence; and all that we are evil in, by a divine thrusting on.—i. 2.

Between George Eliot's picture of men as playthings of circumstance and Shakespeare's as slaves of passion there is all the difference in the world. "King Lear" is the tragedy of undutifulness. The converse drama is "Coriolanus," in which filial piety gains a signal triumph, and brings peace to two warring States. The third scene of the fifth act is one of the grandest and most significant in all Shakespeare. Ungrateful Rome lies at the feet of the victorious Coriolanus; all is ready for his great revenge; all feelings of compunction have been stifled; all entreaties, even of his dearest aged friend, have been in vain—when his mother comes, together with his wife, her young boy, and the noble virgin Valeria. Now these others scarce speak, it is not they who prevail—but his mother Volumnia. The great general, at the summit of power and success, is aghast at the sight of her kneeling to him instead of he to her.

What is this?

Your knees to me? to your corrected son?
Then let the pebbles on the hungry beach
Fillip the stars; then let the mutinous winds
Strike the proud cedars 'gainst the fiery sun;
Murdering impossibility, to make
What cannot be, slight work.

And so it comes about that the proud spirit of Coriolanus yields, and he who, in the character of a soldier and a citizen, has showed himself so impatient and self-willed, so imperious and unbending, appears in the character of a son quite different, and both listens and obeys.

But though Shakespeare appears as the champion of parental power, he does not run into excess and defend that abuse of it which allows daughters to be given away in marriage at the mere wish of their parents without their inclination being consulted; or, still worse, their marriage being made void by the absence of the consent of the parents. True, the vile Cloten argues against the validity of Imogen's marriage; but his ground is that royalty has a special marriage law of its own.

The contract you pretend with that base wretch
 is no contract, none:
And tho' it be allowed in meaner parties,
 to knit their souls
 in self-figured knot,

Yet you are curbed from that enlargement by
 The consequence o' the crown ; and must not soil
 The precious note of it with a base slave.

"Cymbeline," ii. 3.

Nor is this sophistry allowed to prevail in the story ; and Imogen remains faithful to her chosen husband during his absence and is happily united to him in the end. Again, the father of Desdemona can do nothing against her marriage when he finds she has not been the victim of witchcraft, but has married the Moor of her free will. Let us hear, too, her words just before, when her father challenged her obedience :

My noble father,
 I do perceive here a divided duty :
 To you, I am bound for life and education ;
 My life and education both do learn me
 How to respect you ; you are the lord of duty ;
 I am hitherto your daughter : but here's my husband ;
 And so much duty as my mother show'd
 To you, preferring you before her father,
 So much I challenge that I may profess
 Due to the Moor, my lord.—"Othello," i. 3.

Then again, in the "Merchant of Venice," the "Taming of the Shrew," and "Midsummer Night's Dream," we see obstacles overcome that fathers have placed in the way of their daughters' free choice ; while the catastrophe in "Romeo and Juliet" is brought about by the parents attempting to force their daughter to marry against her will. And they knew better : for Capulet, before he knew that Juliet would oppose his wishes, had said :

But woo her, gentle Paris, get her heart,
 My will to her consent is but a part ;
 An she agree, within her scope of choice
 Lies my consent and fair according voice.

"Romeo and Juliet," i. 2.

The proper relation also of a father to the marriage of his son is set forth by Polixenes, when, in disguise, he speaks with his own son, Florizel, who has just declared his intention to marry the seeming shepherdess, Perdita.

POLIXENES. Soft, swain, awhile, 'beseech you ;
 Have you a father ?
 FLORIZEL. I have ; but what of him ?
 POL. Knows he of this ?
 FLOR. He neither does, nor shall.
 POL. Methinks a father
 Is, at the nuptial of his son, a guest
 That best becomes the table. Pray you, once more ;

Is not your father grown incapable
Of reasonable affairs?

FLO. No, good sir;
He has his health and ampler strength, indeed,
Than most have of his age.

POL. By my white beard,
You offer him, if this be so, a wrong
Something unfilial : reason, my son
Should choose himself a wife ; but as good reason,
The father (all whose joy is nothing else
But fair posterity) should hold some counsel
In such a business.—“A Winter's Tale,” iv. 3.

Shakespeare, in truth, can be said to be the exponent of the traditional Christian view of the relations of parents and children, of the nature of marriage and of the position of women. On this last point he shows wonderful penetration. Let us, by way of comparison, refer once more to George Eliot, who has this in common with Shakespeare, that she has painted for us a wonderful gallery of female portraits. There is this vital difference between the novelist and the poet, that the one is unfair to the whole male sex, and thus places her characters in untrue surroundings ; whereas the other is completely fair. George Eliot (as Dr. Peter Bayne pointed out in a paper read before the New Shakespeare Society) was the champion of women : her only male heroes were Adam Bede and Savonarola. She never showed “the mystery of feminine malignity ;” and her works were mainly an indictment of men in favour of women. There is no sign of this in Shakespeare ; and he is equally free, on the other hand, from Milton's scorn of women. In Milton's writings, as Dr. Johnson, in his pointed way, observes, there appears “something like a Turkish contempt of females, as subordinate and inferior beings. That his own daughters might not break the ranks, he suffered them to be depressed by a mean and penurious education. He thought women made only for obedience, and man only for rebellion.” (“Life of Milton.”)

Nothing could be more unlike Shakespeare than this ; nothing more opposed to his principles of politics and economics than public disobedience and private despotism. The noble characters he has drawn of women are the best proof of how far he was from that pagan estimate—that they are to serve, according to circumstances, as man's plaything or as his drudge. It is impossible to think of Portia, of Helena, of Isabella, of Imogen, or again, of Hermione or Queen Katharine, in either capacity, and marriage appears as a perpetual union of man and woman for their mutual support. But of that domestic society the man is the head and not the woman—

Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper,
 Thy head, thy sovereign; one that cares for thee,
 And for thy maintenance; commits his body
 To painful labour both by sea and land;
 To watch the night in storms, the day in cold,
 While thou liest warm at home, secure and safe;
 And craves no other tribute at thy hands,
 But love, fair looks, and true obedience,—
 Too little payment for so great a debt.

“Taming of the Shrew,” v. 2.

Nor does Shakespeare fail to portray, with a master hand, the vices and weaknesses of women; but it is done not maliciously but impartially; and he metes out the same rigorous justice to men.

Let us turn to another department of economics, the relations of the upper to the lower classes, of masters and rich people to servants and dependants. Now Shakespeare's position will be best understood by first saying what he was not—namely, that he was not entangled by either of two mischievous delusions that darken the eyes of our contemporaries, and, like most errors on social subjects, have their root in a want of sound theology. The one error is to ignore the perpetual gulf between the rude multitude and the cultivated few; the other is to make too much of it, and to misunderstand it. Now the first error paints for us a dark picture of the past, a brighter picture of the present, and a golden picture of the future. Perhaps the different epochs are specified, and we are told how the masses were first sunk in cannibalism, and then passed through slavery, and after that through serfdom, till they reached the modern epoch of liberty; though now it is more usual to consider the present period as transitory, namely, that it is the epoch of “wagedom,” to be followed by the really golden age of co-operative—or, as others would prefer, socialistic—production. At any rate, the odious distinctions of upper and lower classes, of masters and servants, are to cease; and we are all, in one way or another, to be industrious fellow producers and cultivated fellow citizens. This happy consummation moreover will be the sooner reached, the more fully we trust the people, the more completely in all matters of legislation we are guided by their voices.

This view of the masses, with various minor modifications, is still widely held in England and America, and is the staple of much Radical oratory. But there are objections to the view. It is so opposed to the real course of history, that no true historical student can be ensnared by it. Then, secondly, it is so contrary to human nature, and the facts of real life, that no great observer of men and things can hold it. And, thirdly, it presupposes

that men are not fallen, that human nature is not corrupted, that the earth has not been smitten with a curse. Now, Shakespeare could not, if he wished, have been an historical student; and so he had not that first security against being a Utopian dreamer. But then he had the two other securities: he held *à priori* the Christian view of life, and none have ever surpassed that acute observer in *à posteriori* knowledge of men and their ways. Hence he saw clearly that the relation of master and servant was essential if there was to be any civilized life, that is, if there was to be any literature, science, art, and national, as distinct from tribal or domestic, life. The jesting fancy he puts into the mouth of Gonzalo in "The Tempest" shows what he deemed needful in sober reality:

I the commonwealth I would by contraries
Execute all things; for no kind of traffic
Would I admit; no name of magistrate;
Letters should not be known; riches, poverty,
And use of service, none; contract, succession,
Bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, none;
No use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil;
No occupation; all men idle, all;
And women too; but innocent and pure:
No sovereignty. . . .
All things in common nature should produce
Without sweat or endeavour: treason, felony,
Sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any engine,
Would I not have; but nature should bring forth,
Of its own kind, all foison, all abundance,
To feed my innocent people.—"Tempest," ii. 1.

But among fallen men in a sterile world there must in political life be the distinction of rulers and ruled, the rulers, and not the ruled, having the sword of justice; and in economical life there must be the distinction of masters and servants, the masters, and not the servants, having learning and wealth. Thus Shylock is able to silence the court by a dexterous appeal to this principle, which, though often unpalatable, is always true:

You have among you many a purchased slave,
Which, like your asses, and your dogs and mules,
You use in abject and in slavish parts,
Because you bought them:—shall I say to you,
Let them be free, marry them to your heirs?
Why sweat they under burdens? let their beds
Be made as soft as yours, and let their palates
Be season'd with such viands. You will answer,
The slaves are ours:—so do I answer you.
"Merchant of Venice," iv. 1.

Shakespeare, be it observed, has an uncompromising way of calling a spade a spade. To scrub the floor, black boots, clean dirty clothes, groom horses, fetch and carry, and much else, are abject or low occupations—that is, are unfit for those who much exercise the higher faculties of our nature; and slavish in Shakespeare's sense is also a word that can be applied to them. For slave appears used not in the technical sense it has now, but as a rather contemptuous expression—like peasant or groom—to designate one of the lower classes (“*King Lear*,” iii. 7; “*Henry V.*,” iv. 1; “*Two Gentlemen of Verona*,” iv. 4). So the word slavish in the passage above is to be taken as the adjective of servant, and like the adjective in the ecclesiastical phrase “servile work.” And in this sense the occupation of most men must ever be “slavish,” and no amount of inflated language will ever make it otherwise. But we are so accustomed to euphemisms that Shakespeare's tongue sounds rough. If a man now is a “lean unwashed artificer” (“*King John*,” iv. 2), we do not say so, nor speak in print of “the breath of garlic eaters” (“*Coriolanus*,” iv. 6), nor send the message, “Bid them wash their faces and keep their teeth clean” (*Ibid.* ii. 2), nor venture to say to the crowd in Trafalgar Square :

Hence ; home, you idle creatures, get you home ;
Is this a holiday ? What ! know you not,
Being mechanical, you ought not walk
Upon a labouring day, without the sign
Of your profession ?—Speak, what trade art thou ?

1ST CITIZEN. Why, sir, a carpenter.

MARULLUS. Where is thy leather apron and thy rule,
What dost thou with thy best apparel on ?

“*Julius Cæsar*,” i. 1.

I am not dealing directly with politics, and it is enough to mention the two plays, “*Julius Cæsar*” and “*Coriolanus*,” as being satires on mob rule as keen as the “*Knights*” of Aristophanes ; and the “*Midsummer Night's Dream*” ought to be put on the Radical Index for venturing to set forth so irreverently the deeds of Quince the carpenter, Snug the joiner, Bottom the weaver, Flute the bellows-mender, Snout the tinker, and Starveling the tailor. What more immediately concerns us is the wonderful description of a social revolution given in “*The Second Part of King Henry VI.*,” where the rebellion of Jack Cade is described. The account is not historical, but that does not matter ; and no reasoning could set forth more convincingly the horror and futility of such revolutions than those terrible scenes. Seven scenes in the fourth act set before us the course of the insurrection. We are first introduced to two subordinates, and the following is a portion of their conversation :

JOHN. Well, I say it was never merry world in England since gentlemen came up.

GEORGE. O miserable age! Virtue is not regarded in handicraftsmen.

JOHN. The nobility think scorn to go in leather aprons.

GEORGE. Nay more, the king's council are no good workmen.

JOHN. True. And yet it is said,—labour in thy vocation: which is as much to say, as,—let the magistrates be labouring men; and therefore should we be magistrates.

Then Jack Cade himself enters, whom Shakespeare depicts as a vile mixture of vanity, cunning and cruelty; and with him his ferocious helpmate, Dick the butcher. Let us hear some of his projects of reformation:

CADE. There shall be, in England, seven halfpenny loaves sold for a penny: the three-hooped pot shall have ten hoops; and I will make it felony to drink small beer: all the realm shall be in common, and in Cheapside shall my palfrey go to grass. And when I am king (as king I will be)——

ALL. God save your majesty!

CADE. I thank you, good people:—there shall be no money; all shall eat and drink on my score; and I will apparel them all in one livery, that they may agree like brothers, and worship me their lord.

DICK. The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers.

CADE. Nay, that I mean to do.

They make a beginning by killing, not exactly a lawyer, but a man of the pen, the clerk of Chatham. Then proceeding victoriously to Blackbeath, they purpose to break open the gaols of London and let out the prisoners. The terrible news is brought to the king that Jack Cade has occupied Southwark:

His army is a ragged multitude

Of hinds and peasants, rude and merciless

All scholars, lawyers, courtiers, gentlemen,

They call false caterpillars, and intend their death.

And another messenger brings news:

Jack Cade hath gotten London Bridge;

The citizens fly and forsake their houses;

The rascal people, thirsting after prey,

Join with the traitor; and they jointly swear

To spoil the city and your royal court.

The scene shifts to Jack Cade and his triumph. All written documents, the title deeds of wealth and privilege, are to be destroyed:—

So, sirs:—now go some and pull down the Savoy; others to the inns of court; down with them all

Away, burn all the records of the realm: my mouth shall be the

parliament of England. . . . And henceforward all things shall be in common.

Then follows the touching scene where Lord Say, whom the rebels have captured, pleads in vain for his life. And see here how true Shakespeare is to nature. It is no cruel tyrant and grinder down of the poor, that receives in melodramatic fashion the terrible reward of his misdeeds. For in real life—and this is one of the characteristics of social convulsions—the well-doers and benefactors of the poor suffer indiscriminately with the evil-doers, whose misdeeds have brought on the catastrophe. Nay, the good, taking less precautions, are more likely to be victims. So Lord Say is painted as the model of a Christian gentleman, using his gifts and wealth for the general good. But in vain he pleads:—

Long sitting to determine poor men's causes,
Hath made me full of sickness and diseases. . . .
Have I affected wealth, or honour? speak.
Are my chests fill'd up with extorted gold?
Is my apparel sumptuous to behold?
Whom have I injur'd, that ye seek my death?

This, and the rest of his pathetic pleading, is only the occasion for mockery, and does not stop them from slaying him. The next scene is equally characteristic, showing the sudden collapse of the rebellion, the "rabblement" being drawn by a little artful management to desert their leader. And we see no issue of the uprising beyond a train of ruin and blood.

Are those then who have riches and power in their hands to look on Shakespeare as their uncompromising ally, furnishing them with a matchless supply of pointed sayings with which to crush all vile Radicals and reformers for evermore? Are they to proclaim him as the great "Conservative" champion? Perhaps it may seem so from what I have said till now. But let them not be too quick in their conclusion; and let me say to them with Portia: "Tarry a little; there is something else." Yes; there is something else; for the doctrine that man is weak and fallen is not the whole of Christianity; and that the mass of the people must be poor and uncultivated is not the only teaching of economics; there is something else taught besides. And if those who would make Shakespeare a flatterer of the people, a revolutionist, or a State Socialist, grossly misunderstand him; those misunderstand him no less who think of him as a cynical scoffer at the ignorance and rudeness of the poor, a worshipper of culture and of power, an apologist for every selfish plutocracy. Shakespeare laughed, not at poverty, but at insolent poverty; not at rude ignorance and horny hands, but at the ignorant

trying to sit in the seat of the learned, and those who follow the plough putting on the garments of elegance and leisure. He knew how to honour the poor, and all the better because he would not flatter them. He was not one "of those democratists, who, when they are not on their guard, treat the humbler part of the community with the greatest contempt, whilst at the same time they pretend to make them the depositaries of all power" (Burke, "Reflections on the Revolution in France"). Milton was one of these, alternately flattering and reviling the mass of the people, and in this, just as in his treatment of women, he was a complete contrast to his great predecessor. Let us remember that there are different kinds of derision. It is one thing to make the plain-spoken Coriolanus utter some home truths about the "mutable rank-scented many," and "common fools" ("Coriolanus," iii. 1): it is quite another thing to make the solemn chorus in "Samson Agonistes" chant in melodious verse the expressions of exquisite scorn:

Nor do I name of men the common rout,
That wand'ring loose about,
Grow up and perish, like the summer flies,
Heads without name no more remembered.

The great poet of Protestantism anticipates Goethe, the great poet of Rationalism; and their resemblance in their contempt of the uncultured masses is no accident. Much might be written on this. Enough here to notice that this truly un-Christian contempt is not depth but shallowness, and that pride is justly punished by becoming the slave of sensible appearances, judging like a mere child from what it sees, smells, and hears, and going by feeling, not by reason. But Shakespeare was not of this sort. He had wisdom and religion enough to penetrate below the rude exterior, not to be dazzled by phenomena, but to see things as they are, and to recognize in each man the image and likeness of God. He will not hear of any equality in capacities and culture, in wealth and power; but then he knows that these things are mere trifles compared with those in which rich and poor are equal; that we all have the same nature, are all called to the same exalted end, the supernatural union with God; that our moral dispositions are what is all important, and are not affected one way or the other by our garments being tattered, our breath strong of garlic, our occupation slavish.

For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich;
And as the sun breaks thro' the darkest clouds,
So honour peereth in the meanest habit.

"Taming of the Shrew," iv. 3.

Poor and content, is rich, and rich enough.

"Othello," iii. 3.

It is no cultured gentleman who interposes to check Cornwall in his wicked purpose to pluck out the eyes of the aged Duke of Gloucester, but a servant—

Hold your hand, my lord;
I have served you ever since I was a child,
But better service have I never done you,
Than now to bid you hold.—“King Lear,” iii. 7.

And it is another servant who goes for flax and whites of eggs for Gloucester's bleeding face, and a rustic tenant who is ready to help him in his need, “come on't what will” (iv. 1). Again, when we have had our laugh at the uncouth clowns in “Midsummer Night's Dream,” the course of merriment is for a moment suspended, to remind us that they are men no other than ourselves, and that uncouthness is wholly distinct from vice. Philostrate, the master of revels, tells of the ridiculous character of their play. Then Duke Theseus inquires

What are they that do play it?
PHILOSTRATE. Hard-handed men that work in Athens here,
Which never labour'd in their minds till now;
And now have toil'd their unbreath'd memories
With this same play, against your nuptial.

THESEUS. And we will hear it.

PHILOSTRATE. No, my noble lord,
It is not for you: I have heard it over,
And it is nothing, nothing in the world,
(Unless you can find sport in their intents,)
Extremely stretch'd and conn'd with cruel pain,
To do you service.

THESEUS. I will hear that play;
For never anything can be amiss,
When simpleness and duty tender it. . . .
Our sport shall be to take what they mistake;
And what poor duty cannot do,
Noble respect takes it in might, not merit. . . .
Love therefore, and tongue-tied simplicity,
In least speak most, to my capacity.

“Midsummer Night's Dream,” v. 1.

How pleasing is the character of the old shepherd, and what grace is thrown round peasant life, in “A Winter's Tale.” This is still more so in the delightful comedy “As You Like It,” where Corin the shepherd and Adam the servant are among the most attractive characters in the play. Corin is very poor, but is courteous in speech, kind and hospitable in deeds; simple, and without that unmannerly aping of gentility which renders the poor ridiculous. So when Touchstone twits him with never

having seen good manners, because he was never at court, he can answer :

Not a whit, Touchstone : those that are good manners at the court are as ridiculous in the country, as the behaviour of the country is most mockable at the court.—“ As You Like It,” iii. 2.

And he can describe himself with true dignity :

Sir, I am a true labourer ; I earn that I eat, get that I wear ; owe no man hate, envy no man's happiness ; glad of other men's good, content with my harm ; and the greatest of my pride is, to see my ewes graze and my lambs suck.—*Ibid.*

In the same play the old servant Adam gives up all the savings of a life-time to provide for his young master Orlando, and for his sake becomes a wanderer when nigh fourscore years old.

Master, go on ; and I will follow thee,

To the last gasp with truth and loyalty.—ii. 3.

He indeed deserved well the praise he received :

O good old man : how well in thee appears

The constant service of the antique world,

When service sweat for duty, not for need.—*Ibid.*

Returning to peasant life, let us listen to some portions of the soliloquy of King Henry in “ Third Part of King Henry VI.”—(ii. 5.)

O God ! methinks it were a happy life,
To be no better than a homely swain. . . .
So many hours must I tend my flock ;
So many hours must I take my rest ;
So many hours must I contemplate ;
So many hours must I sport myself ;
So many days my ewes have been with young ;
So many weeks ere the poor fools will yeau ;
So many years ere I shall shear the fleece ;
So minutes, hours, days, months, and years,
Pass'd over to the end they were created,
Would bring white hairs unto a quiet grave.
Ah ! what a life were this ! how sweet ! how lovely !
Gives not the hawthorn-bush a sweeter shade
To shepherds, looking on their silly sheep,
Than doth a rich embroidered canopy
To kings, that fear their subject's treachery ?

And if he sees virtue behind rusticity, Shakespeare is equally keen to strip off the mask of respectability that wealth hangs up before vice.

Through tatter'd clothes small vices do appear ;
Robes and furr'd gowns hide all. Plate sin with gold,
And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks ;
Arm it in rags, a pigmy's straw doth pierce it.

“ King Lear,” iv. 6.

Oh, what a world of vile ill-favoured faults
Looks handsome in three hundred pounds a year!
"Merry Wives of Windsor," iii. 4.

Gold? yellow, glittering, precious gold?
. . . . Thus much of this will make
Black, white; foul, fair; wrong, right;
. . . . This yellow slave
Will knit and break religions; bless the accurs'd;
Make the hoar leprosy ador'd; place thieves,
And give them title, knee, and approbation,
With senators on the bench.—"Timon of Athens," iv. 3.

Nor has dollar-hunting ever been more sharply satirised than in that oft reiterated counsel of Iago to Roderigo: "Put money in thy purse" ("Othello" i. 3). In contrast to which we may listen to the soliloquy of the good yeoman, Iden, as he walks in his garden:—

Lord, who would live turmoiled in the court,
And may enjoy such quiet walks as these?
This small inheritance, my father left me,
Contenteth me, and 's worth a monarchy.
I seek not to wax great by others' waning;
Or gather wealth I care not with what envy?
Sufficeth that I have maintains my state,
And sends the poor well pleasèd from my gate.
"Second Part of King Henry VI.," iv. 10.

The poor can indeed claim Shakespeare as their true friend. He knew their needs, sympathized with their troubles, and was an enemy of their oppressors. He was no mouthing demagogue; his maxim was not that of the bastard in "King John":—

Well, whiles I am a beggar, I will rail,
And say—there is no sin but to be rich;
And being rich, my virtue then shall be,
To say—there is no vice but beggary.
"King John," ii. 2.

This is the procedure of the sham *ami du peuple*. But Shakespeare was not a sham in anything. His sympathy with the poor is genuine. How true and touching, for example, is that scene in "Romeo and Juliet" (v. 2), where Romeo offers forty ducats to the half-starved apothecary for a dram of poison, though to sell it is a capital offence. The temptation is too strong, the need is too great, and the poor man utters the words that have been uttered a thousand times in every tongue and every age:—

My poverty, but not my will, consents.

In truth Shakespeare knew well enough that "freedom of contract" between rich and poor, strong and weak, was a contradic-

tion in terms, and a mere mask for iniquitous extortion. And of all oppressors of the poor, great and small, he was the enemy. But here it is impossible fully to understand him without a few words of historical explanation. Any one must be struck with the fact that lawyers, justices, and the inferior officers of the law appear in no pleasant light in his pages. To be a process-server appears as one of the "knavish professions" that had been pursued in the course of his life by the arch-rogue, Autolycus ("Winter's Tale," iv. 2). The imbecile city officers, Dogberry and Verges (in "Much Ado About Nothing"), and Elbow, the constable (in "Measure for Measure") are well matched by the country justices, Shallow and Silence (in "Henry IV." and "The Merry Wives of Windsor"). Lear says with much method in his madness:—

A man may see how this world goes, with no eyes. Look with thine ears: see how yon justice rails upon yon simple thief. Hark, in thine ear: change places; and, handy-dandy, which is the justice, which is the thief? . . . a dog's obeyed in office.

Thou rascal beadle hold thy bloody hand!

. . . Strip thine own back.—"King Lear," iv. 6.

And lawyers fare no better. Timon exclaims with bitterness:—

Crack the lawyer's voice

That he may never more false title plead,

Nor sound his quillet's [quibbles] shrilly.

"Timon of Athens," iv. 3.

Listen also to Hamlet in the graveyard:—

There's another! Why might not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his quiddits [subtleties] now, his quilletts, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel, and will not tell him of his action of battery? Humph! This fellow might be in 's time a great buyer of land, with his statutes, his recognizances, his fines, his double vouchers, his recoveries: is this the fine of his fines, and the recovery of his recoveries, to have his fine pate full of fine dirt? will his vouchers vouch him no more of his purchases, and double ones too, than the length and breadth of a pair of indentures? The very conveyances of his lands will hardly lie in this box; and must the inheritor himself have no more? ha!—"Hamlet," v. 1.

And in a previous scene (i. 3) he had complained of "the law's delay," and "the insolence of office."

What is the meaning of all this? Why again does he paint the common people in Jack Cade's rebellion as filled with such particular hatred against the lawyers, or allow Cade to justify his intention of slaying them by the following argument:—

Is not this a lamentable thing, that of the skin of an innocent lamb should be made parchment? that parchment, being scribbled

o'er, should undo a man? Some say the bee stings; but I say 'tis the bee's wax, for I did but seal once to a thing, and I was never mine own man since.—"Second Part of King Henry VI.," iv. 2.

Are we to conclude that Shakespeare, like some youthful and red-hot Radical, imagined that the agents, guardians, and interpreters of the law were at best drones, and mostly vampires, making a mystery of what is simple in order to profit by the obscurity? Did he think that in a wealthy and highly cultivated society every cause could be decided at little cost in a brief space of time, were it not for the interested devices of the legal profession? Nothing could be more absurd. For Shakespeare was pre-eminently no fanatic, rode no hobbies, and understood the realities of life, the complicated relations of men and things, the difficulties of applying the principles of justice, simple in themselves, to the endless variety of concrete cases, the need of laws and of a learned class to study them and apply them. But every sort of power in this world is liable to abuse, and the great abuse in England during Shakespeare's youth was precisely that of the law, that was accessory to dreadful wrongs committed against the common people. The sixteenth century in England witnessed two great movements closely connected with one another—one the destruction of the ancient religion, the other of the ancient petty tenantry of the country. The first great method of destroying the small cultivators was by enclosures on the part of the rich, breaking up the common fields and methods of cultivation, and lessening the common pastures, so that the cottiers, now isolated and stinted, were compelled in multitudes to part with their land to escape starvation. We are introduced in "Second Part of King Henry VI.," i. 3, to a poor petitioner of the whole township, who presents a petition: "Against the Duke of Suffolk for enclosing the commons of Melford." The second great method of destroying the poorer tenants was by turning them out neck and crop, sometimes by legal process, sometimes without even any show of law. This method was most conspicuous over the vast estates that had once belonged to the Church, and where the small tenants had been especially well off, but were now the victims of greedy courtiers and unscrupulous speculators. Let us hear Professor Nasse ("Agricultural Community of the Middle Ages," 2nd edition, pp. 91, 92).

Copyholders were driven in great numbers from their rural hides. . . . His [the poor peasant's] rights rested on the custom of the manor, which was to be proved from the manor roll in the possession of the lord of the manor, and a copyholder could lose these rights by numerous acts. . . . The small copyholders were not in a position to establish such rights before learned tribunals, when opposed by experienced advocates. Latimer, on this account, accuses the judges

even of injustice and corruption, being open to bribes, and maintains that "in these days gold is all-powerful with the tribunals." . . . A time . . . while so great a revolution in Church and State was in progress, could not have been favourable for the support of rights which were dependent upon custom. . . . Thus, a publication which appeared in the year 1546 complains that the new possessors of Church property generally declared that, by the secularization, all the old rights of the copyholders were extinguished.

And the late Mr. Cliffe Leslie pertinently asked :

Not to speak of the risks of an "action for battery" against a powerful noble if he chose to have him knocked on the head, how was the copyholder to produce a box of conveyances in the control of the lord himself? Was it likely that the small proprietor could outwit the lord's sharp lawyer, with "his cases, his tenures, and his tricks?" The burning hatred which the peasantry of his own time felt towards the ministers of a legal system by which they were oppressed and ruined, breathes in the language which the great dramatist puts in the mouth of Cade and his followers.*

The acutest phase of the evil was indeed over when Shakespeare (born in 1564) was first of an age to observe and reason. Thousands of evicted peasants had been hanged under the title of thieves or vagabonds; thousands had been shot down as "rebels" by foreign mercenaries; thousands more had perished by starvation. But the remembrance of that vast multitude of victims had not faded out, and was refreshed by the continuance in a mitigated form of the same misdeeds. The number of vagrants can be taken as some index of the number of the evicted; for eviction was the main cause of vagrancy. Now a stream of blood flows through the reign of Elizabeth, a year seldom passing in which 300 to 400 vagrants were not executed. For vagrancy was a capital crime,† and the law, with something more than the law, was enforced with ferocity. Thus in the single county of Somersetshire in one year forty persons were executed and thirty-five branded; again, in the year 1598, in Devonshire seventy-four persons were hung. Shakespeare knew of these things, saw the victims of legal and illegal oppression, heard the old men tell of the terrible past, and all the bitterness of his words on the law and its ministers becomes intelligible; nay, we marvel at his moderation and self-control, and that he did not become, like his own Thersites (in "Troilus

* "Land Systems of England and the Continent," p. 218.

† By the Act 14 Elizabeth, cap. 5, any one falling a second time into a "roguish life," and being over eighteen, was to suffer death as a felon, "unless some credible person will take him into service for two years. And if he fall a third time into a roguish life, he shall be adjudged a felon."

necessitous borrowers from the Jew, and compelled him to grant easier terms to the remainder. Others he enabled to pay back both interest and principal, and thus escape the forfeiture to which an iniquitous bargain had bound them, and which a feeble law permitted; indeed, his own case was only an extreme example of the iniquities he prevented. The whole play may be considered as a sort of *reductio ad absurdum* of the political doctrine that the State exists only to protect property and enforce contracts, and of the economical doctrine that credit is a blessing and usury a nightmare. What a pitiable part is played by the Venetian authorities. Shylock has the upper hand with them :

He plies the duke at morning, and at night;
And doth impeach the freedom of the state
If they deny him justice: twenty merchants,
The duke himself, and the magnificoes
Of greatest port, have all persuaded with him;
But none can drive him from the envious plea
Of forfeiture, of justice, and his bond.—iii. 2.

Antonio perfectly grasps the situation.

The duke cannot deny the course of law,
For the commodity that strangers have
With us in Venice, if it be denied,
Will much impeach the justice of the state:
Since that the trade and profit of the city
Consisteth of all nations.—iii. 3.

And in the trial Shylock claims to have his due according to the bond, and threatens :

If you deny it, let the danger light
Upon your charter, and your city's freedom.—iv. 1.

We might think we were listening to the old debates on the factory laws, when the protection of women and children from all manner of cruelties and horrors had to overcome the oft-repeated objection: British interests will be prejudiced by this sentimental legislation; British manufactures unable to hold their own in foreign markets; British trade hampered. As though man was for the sake of trade, not trade for the sake of man. And usury is shown in its true light in this play. Elsewhere, indeed, there is casual reference to it. The popular horror of usurers is shown in the first scene of "Coriolanus," and in the third scene of the fourth act of "A Winter's Tale." In "King Lear" a usurer appears on the same line as the worst of criminals (iv. 6); and the "advantages of credit," on which the economists have dilated, are briefly summed up by "Keep thy hand from lenders' books and defy the foul fiend" (iii. 4). A similar warning is to

be found in "Hamlet" (i. 3); but the "Merchant of Venice" is the classical play for the usury question. Had I been writing even a few years ago, it would have been necessary to make an apology for Shakespeare; to lament his ignorance, to excuse him as the victim of a dark age and unable to shake off in those pre-Adam-Smithite pre-Benthamite times the illusions of the Middle Ages. Now, however, we are mostly of another mind. Usury laws have been restored in parts of the British Empire, of Europe, and of America; and our wonder now is how even the matchless dulness and assurance of Jeremy Bentham could write the "Defence of Usury" in the face of the "Merchant of Venice." I am not going to weary my readers with a disquisition on usury.* Enough that extortion of any kind is always wrong; that to take back anything more than the principal on a loan of money, apart from all extortion, is, under certain circumstances, also wrong; that those circumstances may be now the exception, and may have been the rule in Shakespeare's England or in the Middle Ages, but that this difference does not alter the truth of the mediæval doctrine; finally, that what is wrong in all dealings with property should as far as possible be prevented and punished by law. A good State should have rendered the efforts of Antonio against usury superfluous. If the law had been as it ought, there would have been no occasion for Bassanio's desperate advice to alter it then and there in court, so as to meet the particular case, or for Portia's evasion of it by a successful quibble. Extortion should be penal, extortionate contracts void, Antonio's bond, so far as the forfeit went, not worth the parchment it was written on. And we have still not fully learnt the lesson of this play. Else how can any one still have the face to meet the cry of distress by an appeal to their contracts, to their bonds, and imitate the very words of Shylock when asked to have at hand some surgeon?

Is it so nominated in the bond?

PORTIA. It is not so express'd; but what of that?

T'were good you do so much for charity.

SHYLOCK. I cannot find it; 'tis not in the bond.—iv. 1.

And how can any one still use that most feeble of pleas for wrong doing, that he has a right to do what he likes with his own, when this was precisely what Shylock said, when he complained that Antonio had held him up to opprobrium?

And all for use of that which is mine own.—i. 3.

In truth the plutocrat fares no better in Shakespeare's hands than the demagogue.

* Much can be got in short compass about usury from an article in the *Month* of last September.

It is time to bring this paper to a close; and I will only briefly call attention to two points more. One is that Shakespeare, by an incidental remark, shows that he knows how to reason on such technical matters as value and market price. Wise Hector is arguing against the impetuous youth Troilus, and urging the fitness of surrendering Helen to the Greeks:

Brother, she is not worth what she doth cost

The holding.

TROILUS. What's aught but as 'tis valued?

HECTOR. But value dwells not in particular will;

It holds his [its] estimate and dignity

As well wherein 'tis precious of itself

As in the prizer.—"Troilus and Cressida," ii. 2.

The second point is, that although Shakespeare did not professedly treat the question of the organization of labour—indeed, it did not form a "question" in his time—still, we can have little doubt as to what his opinion would have been on the disorganization and economical anarchy of our own time and country. If there is anything he advocates it is order, organization, obedience; if there is anything he deprecates, it is headstrong liberty, it is the dominion of appetite, it is the discord, the "oppugnancy," the chaos, that follows. And he expressly alludes to organized industry, namely, to instruction (*i.e.*, proper apprenticeship), to mysteries and trades (*i.e.*, industry organized in guilds or associations), to communities, to degrees in schools, to brotherhoods in cities, as fundamental portions of man's life in society. He who wrote that wonderful imprecation in "Timon of Athens," iv. 1 (I have cited a part of it), and that still grander speech of Ulysses in "Troilus and Cressida," i. 3 (less well known than it ought to be because of the play in which it is set), would never have sanctioned that devouring of the weak by the strong, of the simple by the crafty, which we euphemistically call by the name of free competition.

In conclusion, let me again point out that the writings of Shakespeare are a mine of economical and also of political wisdom, worth a great deal more than many of our professed and classical economists. And why? Was he far "in advance" of his time? Was he an inspired teacher? Was he a sort of demigod? Nothing of the kind, and something much simpler. He was a great master of language, a great and acute observer of life both individual and social, and last and not least he had the key to interpret life. Now this key was the thorough knowledge of Christian doctrine. But Christian doctrine provides a great code of ethics; indeed, every ethical code without it, is but feeble at the best. Moreover, economics and politics

are not separate from, but a part and parcel of, ethics; they are particular as opposed to general ethics; merely the working of the general principles in particular fields. No wonder, then, that Shakespeare, who knew so well both the principles and the fields, was a good economist and political teacher. If indeed we want to be professors of some bran-new science of "political economy" or "sociology," or something else, and to fill pages with discussion of impossible hypotheses or disputes on terminology, to abound in fine phrases and wordy declamation, we shall find Shakespeare very simple and old-fashioned. But he might say of us (for he is a little uncivil at times) what Lorenzo said of Launcelot Gobbo's conversation:

O dear discretion, how his words are suited!
 The fool hath planted in his memory
 An army of good words; and I do know
 A many fools, that stand in better place,
 Garnish'd like him, that for a tricky word,
 Defy the matter.—"Merchant of Venice," iii. 5.

C. S. DEVAS.

ART. V.—ANCIENT BENEDICTINE CUSTOMS.

1. *The Rule of Our Most Holy Father St. Benedict.* Edited, with an English Translation and Explanatory Notes, by A MONK OF ST. BENEDICT'S ABBEY, FORT AUGUSTUS. London: Burns & Oates.
2. *Expositio sive Glossa Regulæ Beati Benedicti.* A MS. in the Library of Christ Church, Canterbury. Written at Rome by JOHN WHYTEFELDE, Monk of Canterbury, in the month of August, the third year of Pope Urban VI.
3. PAULI WARNEFRIDI DIACONI CASINENSIS *in Sanctam Regulam Commentarium.* Typis Montis Casini. 1880.
4. *Vita et Regula SS. P. Benedicti,* una cum Expositione Regulæ a HILDEMARO edita. Ratisbonæ: Sumptibus Friderici Pustet. 1880.
5. *Regula S. Benedicti,* cum Commentariis EDMUNDI MARTÈNE. Migne's "Patrologia Latina," tom lxvi.
6. CALMET.—*Commentaire sur la Règle de Saint-Benoît.* Paris. 1732.

SO much has been written on the Order of St. Benedict and its relation to the outer world that its inner and domestic history has been comparatively ignored. I mean the history of

its progress or decay in the observance of the monastic rule. This is all the more to be regretted as its influence for good on the world without has ever depended on the degree in which the children of St. Benedict have remained faithful to the tenor of life inculcated by their Father and Lawgiver. It is not to be wondered at, however. The daily round of life, with its domestic details, as practised at Monte Cassino or Subiaco, at Fleury or Fulda or Hirschau, at Canterbury or Iona, during the sixth, seventh, eighth, or ninth centuries, was not thought worthy of record by writers, whose imagination was carried away by the conversion and civilization of barbarous races, by the rearing of splendid cathedrals or the foundation of seats of learning. And yet such achievements are the less important part of monastic history. If we could know to what extent silence and monastic simplicity were in favour or languished within the cloisters, we might be able to answer many a puzzling question in our history—as, for example, how it came to pass that, during six hundred years, the growth of the monastic order advanced with seemingly boundless energy, and that after A.D. 1200, as Mabillon says, new foundations became exceedingly rare (“*novæ monasteriorum fundationes rarissimæ fuerunt*”). To write that inner history, however, would be an arduous task. All I propose to do at present is to trace out from original sources, and confining myself to the earliest times of the Order (not later than 1100), the usages of Benedictine life in such matters as the daily routine of hours, food, clothing, buildings, penitential practices, silence, manual labour, study, and so forth. I know I cannot exhaust half my subject-matter within the limits of an article, so I shall leave aside things liturgical, which would require at least another such article to themselves, with much else, I hope, for some other occasion. I must be permitted to begin with a word or two on the works whose titles I have placed at the head of this article.

The Fort Augustus translator of the Holy Rule must be congratulated on the faithful and readable version he has given to the public. To be impartial, however, it must be admitted that, over and over again, he betrays a wish to smooth over by something very like a paraphrase passages which he did not think would bear literally translating, and in some few instances I doubt if he has seized the true meaning. Thus, in chapter lxxii., St. Benedict, repeating what he had laid down in the preceding chapter on *mutual* obedience among the brethren, expresses himself with his usual conciseness and vigour: “*Obedientiam sibi certatim impendant.*” The translator renders this, “Let them vie with one another in obedience,” missing the idea of *mutual* obedience, and leaving it open to be supposed that it is simply in obedience to their superior that they have to emulate

one another. In chapter lxxiii. St. Benedict distinguishes between the "*initium conversationis*" and the "*perfectionem conversationis*." In the first instance, "*conversatio*" is translated "goodness of life;" in the second, "religion." I doubt if either gives quite the real idea. "*Conversatio*" with St. Benedict is rather the monastic life itself considered as a special profession, and he refers to the beginning, the progress (Prologue), and the perfection of the "*conversatio*," and calls the life of unsettled or vagabond monks a "*miserrima conversatio*." So St. Gregory calls the monastic habit "*sanctæ conversationis habitus*." It is simply testifying to the excellence of the translation when one can find nothing to criticize but minutiae of this kind, and only a natural anxiety for a strictly literal version leads one to wish that "*exeuntes a Completorio*" should not be rendered by "when that (Compline) is finished;" or "*obedientiæ bonum*" by "the excellence of obedience;" or that the translator had not sometimes begun and ended his sentences otherwise than in his Latin text, or paraphrased by a gloss the simple word "*digesti*," in chapter viii., into "having had their full sleep." Enough has been said on the merits of this really well-executed translation. In the preface we read that the Latin text, adopted from the edition printed in 1659 by D. Augustine de Ferrariis, has been collated with the thirteenth century MS. actually at Fort Augustus. This suggests a few remarks on the variations in the text of the Benedictine Rule, a subject that has employed the learned labours of the Bavarian Benedictines in their critical edition published at Ratisbon in 1880, and on some of the most ancient extant MSS. of the Rule.

We have no autograph of St. Benedict, though we know that two copies of the Rule, written by his hand, formerly existed, one of them seen by Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, in the Abbey of Marmoutier, at Tours, and the other, which, according to Leo Ostiensis, was taken to Rome from Monte Cassino when the monastery was destroyed by the Lombards, brought back to Monte Cassino by Abbot Petronax, to whom it was given by Pope Zachary, in 718, and destroyed by fire in the time of Abbot Ragemprand. From this latter codex a copy was made by Abbot Theudemar as a present to Charles the Great. As regards existing MSS., with the help of Bishop Haneberg, O.S.B.; Mr. W. H. Bliss; Canon Giuliani, of Verona; D. Gregorio Palmieri, O.S.B.; the Rev. D. Keitz, librarian at Fulda; and D. Celestine Wolfgrüber, O.S.B., the Bavarian editors had the satisfaction of being able to collate the oldest fifteen codices known. Of these, two are in the Royal Library at Munich, two in the British Museum, one in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, one in the Bodleian, one at Fulda, two at Verona, one at St. Gall, one in the

Vatican, one in the library of the Cathedral Chapter at Augsburg, one at Vienna, and one at Einsidlen. The earliest in date is the Oxford manuscript, written about the end of the seventh century; next come the Tegernsee (Munich Library) and St. Gall MSS., belonging to the eighth; while the others were written in the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries. The comparison of these manuscripts has thrown much light on the origin of the well-known and exceedingly ancient *variantes* in the text of the Rule. The manuscripts clearly belong to two families, represented respectively by the Oxford and Tegernsee codices. This is remarkably distinct in the seven earliest, all the MSS. of one class agreeing throughout in their peculiar readings, and differing from the other. The later ones get mixed, though one family predominates. Further, on comparing the Oxford and Tegernsee MSS., the latter looks very much like a revised edition of the former. The solution adopted by the Bavarian editors is that the Saint wrote his rule twice, with slight but frequent textual variations. The two autographs, one taken to Glanfeuil by St. Maurus and the other left at Monte Cassino, became the sources of the two recensions. The older edition is represented by the Bodleian codex. The Fort Augustus MS. belongs to the Tegernsee recension, though, being of late date, it is slightly mixed; so that, out of sixteen *variantes*, taken at random, thirteen agree with the Tegernsee, three only with the Bodleian.

The centenary year of 1880 saw the publication of the two oldest commentaries on the Benedictine Rule, which for upwards of a thousand years had lain hidden in manuscript. From the press of Monte Cassino issued that of Paul Warnfrid, usually known as Paul Deacon. A Lombard by birth, and Chancellor of the Lombard Kingdom under the last of its kings, he was taken prisoner by Charles the Great, whose esteem and favour he won by his learning and piety. His last years were spent as a monk at Monte Cassino, where he died in April 799. Manuscripts of his commentary on the Rule are rare: two are at Monte Cassino, from one of which it was printed in 1880; one in the Royal Library at Munich; while a fourth, the title of which is at the head of this Article, is in the Library of Christ Church, Canterbury. Abbot Hildemar's commentary, first published by the Bavarian Fathers in 1880, is in great part copied from Paul Warnfrid's. It has many additions, however, to Warnfrid's text. Hildemar died in France, in 850. The name of the monastery he governed is unknown. The other works, whose titles head this Article, need no special description.

Glancing through the six centuries that intervene between the foundation of Subiaco and that of Citeaux, one's attention is arrested by the reform or revival of St. Benedict of Anian, who

presided at the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, and that commenced at Cluny by St. Oddo about 927, and very faithfully represented by St. Dunstan's reform, who, with SS. Ethelwold and Leward, established the usages of Fleury and Cluny in England, between 964 and 980: about which latter date a colony of monks cleared the forest, which went by the name of Bucktesten, or the "deer-fastness," on the banks of the Dart, some two miles from Aysneperton, now Ashourton, and built the Abbey of St. Mary of Buckfast. Besides the great revival of Aix-la-Chapelle and that of Cluny, there had been between St. Benedict and St. Bernard many vigorous offshoots of monastic life, and we need only recall the names of SS. Augustine of Canterbury, St. Boniface, St. Wilfrid, and St. Bennet Biscop to exemplify the fruitfulness of the Order among Englishmen. But we are concerned only with the inner life of the cloister, not with missionary enterprise: and for permanent and widespread influence the two great centres we have mentioned seem to have a pre-eminence of their own in our history. Their statutes were real developments of St. Benedict's institute. Even in matters of quite secondary importance, the differences between monastic life in the sixth and in the tenth century, as far as we can discern, were wonderfully few: some of them foreseen and expressly permitted in the Rule, and all arising from one or other of two sources, namely, the daily instead of weekly celebration of conventual Mass, and the difference in the length of days and nights in the higher latitudes of our northern climates, which made it inconvenient, or rather impossible, to adopt, at all seasons, such regulations, for example, as finishing Compline and being ready to retire to rest before dark. And now quite enough has been said by way of preamble.

The first point of Benedictine usage that must occupy our attention is the "*dispositio horarum*," the arrangement of hours for the several exercises of the day. As it was not quite the same at all seasons of the year, we will suppose ourselves at the autumnal equinox. In order still more to simplify matters, we might have an eye specially to life as it was at St. Mary of Bucktesten, in the reign of Edgar the Peaceful, A.D. 980, and compare our own usages with those of other times and places. We should then be living under St. Dunstan's "*Concordia Regnarum*"—in other words, be carrying out, in most points, the usages of Fleury or St. Benedict's Abbey on the Loire as they were established in that monastery by St. Oddo, Abbot of Cluny, about the year 930. At about half-past one, the signal is given by the great bell, and the brethren rise from their beds, in the common dormitory where they slept, clothed and girded. St. Benedict had commanded that, except on

Sundays, on which day they were to rise earlier, or at about 1 p.m., they must rise at the eighth hour of the night. According to Roman custom the time from sunset to sunrise is divided into twelve equal parts, and these night hours would of course be longer in winter, shorter in summer. But then, did the hour for rising vary every week or every month? This is in itself improbable, for obvious reasons; and St. Benedict, who, in regard to the day hours, broadly divides the year into two seasons, winter and summer, would hardly have been shifting the hour for Matins all the year round. Our two oldest commentators say simply that he did not, but "*equinoctium custodivit*," kept to the equinoctial time, and counted the eighth hour as 2 A.M. all the year round. At all events, such was believed to have been St. Benedict's intention, and so was it practised by the monks of Monte Cassino in the eighth century. But were the monks to rise at the beginning, middle, or end of the eighth hour—in other words, at 1, 1.30, or 2 A.M.? Abbot Smaragdus, of St. Michael's-on-the-Meuse, in the ninth century, puts the first sign at half-past one, and this was the more common practice on week-days. St. Benedict lays stress on making this part of the divine office a *nocturnal* sacrifice of praise. Hence the constant repetition of such phrases as "*vigiliæ*," "*nocturna laus*," "*nocturnæ horæ*," "*vigiliæ nocturnæ*." Monks are to rest till "a little after midnight," and are "to rise *at night* to praise Him," and fulfil the words of the Psalmist: "In the middle of the night I rose to praise Thee" (Ps. cxviii. 62). Special penance is to be done by any one through whose fault they may have risen later than this the appointed hour. Between the first and second signs of the bell, it became the custom to interpose a considerable interval. St. Dunstan allots to this interval three penitential psalms, with an appropriate collect; then two psalms for the king, queen and friends of the monastery, with collect; lastly two more psalms for the faithful departed. Then, while the boys are entering the choir, a small bell, *tintinnabulum*, is to be kept ringing; and when the boys have finished their triple prayer, apparently a short one, the second bell is to be rung, and the monks sit down to say the fifteen gradual psalms, kneeling after each five, at a sign given by the Superior, and then begin the nocturns. But of all the twenty-two psalms already said, not a word is mentioned in the text of the Rule. The primitive usage of vocal prayer, as laid down by St. Benedict, was simple and comparatively short. Bells of some sort were in use in Benedictine monasteries from the first century of the Order.

To describe the office of Matins itself would be beyond my limits. It was sung standing, and of course, if we are at Buck-

fast, in St. Dunstan's time, according to the plain chant brought from Rome; that subject, however, I willingly leave to more capable writers than myself. If not in the foundation year of Buckfast, yet not long after, the organ was common in English Benedictine monasteries. Matins took more or less time, according as the abbot was more or less speedy in giving the sign to the reader to end the Lessons; if, like Abbot John of Gorze, he had the whole Book of Daniel read through in one night's office, it is probable Matins and Lauds were joined together and lasted till daybreak. As a rule I imagine all was over within two hours, many abbots perhaps even making it much shorter. Matins over, say about half-past three, as we are at September 21, there remains still some time till daybreak, the proper hour for Lauds. How long was this time, and how was it employed? In summer it was very short, in winter longer, and had its own allotted occupations. In later times Lauds were added to Matins without interruption, and even in St. Dunstan's "*Concordia*" the Saint decrees that what St. Benedict says of the summer months only—namely, to leave "a very short interval" between Matins and Lauds—is to be observed in all seasons. The reason was most likely that Lauds were at an uncertain hour; they were to be said "*incipiente luce*," at break of dawn, and uncertain hours easily become inconvenient. But, as long as an interval was observed between Matins and Lauds, St. Benedict would have it employed in study, especially of the Psalms, Lessons, or something that regards the Divine office. Many employed it in prayer, and about the tenth century we find it at Cluny and elsewhere the appointed time for the boys' school of chant, which our fathers seem thus to have thought not contrary to nocturnal silence. There is no doubt that this was owing to St. Benedict's direction—namely, to employ this time in studying the Psalter or Lessons. But the practice was not universal.

Was the time between Matins and Lauds, or between Lauds and Prime, allowed as a time of repose? Though such a practice is not according to the letter of the Rule, and was not allowed by St. Romuald, St. Peter Damian, St. Benedict of Anian, and the earliest Cluniacs, as we learn from Udalric, yet the custom of sleeping after Matins was approved by many saints of our Order at a very early date in its history. Ludovicus Pius (I prefer his Latin title) obtained it for all the monks in his dominions whose monasteries might be situated in towns, a significant circumstance, as I shall presently explain. At Lindisfarne, in St. Corbinian's Monastery, in that of Our Lady at Soissons, at Fleury on all fast-days from Easter to the ides of September, in St. Mildred's at Minster during the Saint's lifetime, in the English monasteries under St. Dunstan's rule on solemn days (between Lauds and Prime), at

St. Vanne from November to Easter in the tenth century (it is said in the statutes of St. Vanne, "that our holy fathers, filled with the Spirit of God, have so decreed," &c.) it was in use. The reason they slept after Matins is plain. The meridian or noon-day sleep allotted by St. Benedict for summer was unsuited to northern countries, while in monasteries situated in towns the monks' intercourse with their neighbours made it impossible for them to go to bed at sunset. On the other hand, St. Benedict's prohibition to rise to Matins later than two o'clock was looked upon as among the more important and inviolable of his statutes; so what was wanted to make up the time of repose was put after Matins. The Carthusians introduced this division of sleep into two parts in the sixteenth century, a circumstance that has assisted them in maintaining intact the rigour of their observance.

We are now come to the interval between Lauds and Prime. This was according to the text of the Rule a short one, not exceeding half an hour, since Lauds were begun at daybreak and Prime is to begin at sunrise, and if we are at the equinox the hour for Prime would be at 6 A.M. This short interval was, according to St. Benedict of Anian, to be employed in washing and preparing for the day's work, by changing the lighter shoes used at night for the day shoes, &c. St. Dunstan puts the time for washing after Lauds in summer, and after Prime at winter, and recommends the prior to allow the brethren to sleep when there is sufficient time to do so, between Lauds and Prime, during the summer months, this morning sleep taking the place of the noon-day repose. Prime begins at six, and, if said as in the Rule, would not exceed a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes. But at a very early date several additions were made to the liturgical office of this hour, which remain in vigour to the present day. It is a most striking example of the survival of monastic usages to compare at this point the usages now in vigour in many houses with what is called the "*Ordo antiquus*," published by Martène, at the end of his commentary. This document, by some erroneously ascribed to St. Benedict, by others to his namesake of Anian, but apparently of earlier date than the latter, represents the discipline of over a thousand years ago. The writer ordains that: "When the brethren assemble for Prime, after the office has been ended let them make their confession to one another, all at the same time making humble prayer for one another." The Confiteor is still said, except on doubles. "This being done let them all go to the chapter-house." Neither this author nor St. Dunstan speaks of the commemoration of our departed brethren, which is announced just before leaving choir for the chapter-house, nor of the *De Profundis*, which, by ancient custom, is said on the way thither.

Turning towards the east let them bow to the cross, and make an inclination to the brethren around them and let them do this whenever they assemble. [Both the ceremonial, the position of the chapter-house, and the cross over the abbot's seat have been accurately preserved in many houses to our own day.] After reading the names of the saints, whose feasts are to be kept on the morrow—(the Martyrology)—let them rise (from their seats) and say together the verse *Pretiosa*, after which follows the prayer to be said by the Superior. Next the verse *Deus in adjutorium* three times with *Gloria Patri*. [This triple *Deus in adjutorium* was known as the “versus ad solvendum silentium,” being the signal for ending the nocturnal silence.] Rising after this verse, the Superior follows with the prayer : *Dirigere et sanctificare*.

So far, all has been accurately kept down to our day, as likewise the chapter of faults which follows immediately. This daily chapter is not among the practices formally enjoined by St. Benedict, although grounded on his command to make known at once to the abbot one's involuntary failings, and to humble oneself immediately if anything committed to one's care has been lost or broken, &c. The public chapter of faults is prescribed by SS. Isidore and Fructuosus, and was the universal practice of the Order in the eighth century, and probably in the seventh. The name “chapter” is derived from the practice of reading and commenting on a chapter of the Rule, imposed according to ancient custom by St. Benedict of Anian, before hearing the accusations, and the term is often used for the building in which the chapter is read, and for any assembly held in the same, and hence, as every monastery and monastic cathedral had its chapter-house for the monks themselves, who formed the community of the monastery or cathedral, and later on for the secular clergy, just as we now talk of the chapter of Westminster or Plymouth. The chapter being read, the abbot began by saying, “*Loquamur de Ordine nostro*.” Then, according to the “*Antiquus Ordo*,” any one who “is in fault is to ask for a penance, and to receive it according to the measure of his fault ; and when the senior asks : What is in question ? (*Quæ est causa ?*) he must answer : *Mea culpa Domine*.” From St. Dunstan's “*Concordia*” it appears that he remained prostrate till he had said *Mea culpa*. Then rising and kneeling in the middle of the chapter-house, he listened to his penance in silence, after which he retired to his place, exactly as is now practised in many monasteries. Udalric, in the “*Consuetudines Cluniacenses*,” immediately after the spontaneous self-accusations, places the proclamations. Any one of the community could proclaim any of his brethren for faults committed. The accused prostrated himself, and the ceremonial observed was the same as that just given. The chapter was

always ended with the verse, *Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini. Qui fecit, &c.*, and the brethren went in silence, each one to his allotted task.

It is now nearly 7 A.M., and as we are at the autumnal equinox, we should have to go to read in the cloister till the close of the second hour, so that, as Paul Warnfrid justly interprets the text of our Holy Father, we begin to sing Tierce in the oratory immediately after eight. That gives two good hours of study. Had it been in summer the interval between Prime and Tierce would have been three hours, and employed in manual labour. Tierce did not occupy alone a quarter of an hour, and then, if in summer, the monks would have read till Sext, if in winter, would have gone to manual labour. This, of course, in St. Benedict's time, when Mass was not said every day as it was a couple of centuries later. But about the hour of Mass I shall speak presently; as to details of the nature of this intellectual and manual labour, they are to be had in abundance, but I fear I could not get them within the limits of this article.

Sext is the portion of the Divine Office allotted to noon. The sixth hour is from eleven till twelve, and I find Sext was often chanted or said at half-past eleven, or even a little later, so as to be ended before noon. It may be as well to note that the bell was rung twice before each hour of the Office, to give time to the brethren in different parts of the monastery and the garden or orchard to prepare themselves and be at the oratory in time. When out harvesting in the fields, they said the Office where they were. At one time of the year, then, they would have had, from 8.30 to 11.30, three hours' manual labour.

But at what time did they dine? In Paschal time, and (except on Wednesdays or Fridays) from Pentecost till September 14, at noon immediately after Sext; as also on all Sundays of the year. At all other times, except in Lent, after None. When, then, was None said? At the equinox the ninth hour fell at three; but the canonical Office of None was ended in summer at about three, during the winter months at about two. In the interval between Sext and None the monks worked during the winter months; in summer the time was allotted to repose or reading at option, even on fast-days, an arrangement which in our northern climates was found not to answer, and led to the introduction of sleep after the night watches, the interval between Sext and None being devoted to manual labour or study. After None, on fast-days out of Lent, the brethren went to dinner. In Lent, dinner followed Vespers.

At the hour of dinner [says the "*Antiquus Ordo*"] at the close of the Office let them wait in choir; and when they hear the *cymbalum* [a gong, apparently] let them hasten, but in order and without con-

fusion, having washed their hands, to enter the refectory; and with their faces turned eastward bowing to the cross, let them sit down to table, each one in his place in perfect silence. No one is to presume to eat or drink before the Lord Abbot, but the Abbot should not delay. When they take the bread let each brother say to his neighbour, *Benedicite*, and let them answer *Dominus*, and the same the first time they drink. It is not necessary to ask a blessing for the other dishes that are on the table. Before they begin to take food let the reader ask the blessing. . . . When any dish is brought from the kitchen, let the server begin to serve from the lowest and serve the Lord Abbot last, and then let them sound the *cymbalum* gently, and say together and slowly, *Benedicite*."

The stone basin for washing hands was in the cloister outside the refectory door; the other ceremonies just described, after the brethren have sat down to table, which are not in the Rule, do not seem to have been very widely adopted in the Order.

The custom of singing Mass daily began at a very early date. It was already an ancient custom at Monte Cassino, in Paul Warnfrid's time, and, as a matter of course, modified to some extent the arrangement of hours laid down in the Rule. The Monte Cassino arrangement in the eighth century was as follows: When it was not a fast-day—*i.e.*, when the brethren dined at noon as in the summer, Tierce was sung, followed immediately by Mass, and after a very brief interval, Sext followed. St. Dunstan commands that on solemn feast-days, two Masses be sung, one after Prime, the other after Tierce; at the latter the brethren received Holy Communion. The Saint exhorts monks to communicate every day, and immediately after Mass orders them to take the *mixtum* (a piece of bread and a drink), "on account of Holy Communion." This is all I can find that approaches to our idea of a morning collation. When dinner was after None, conventual Mass was sung immediately after Sext, and according to the *Concordia Regularis*, the first bell for None was rung as soon as Mass was ended, the weekly kitcheners left the choir, and the rest sat down in their places, awaiting the second bell for None. Paul Warnfrid expressly says that the bell-ringer is to give the celebrant time to lay aside his vestments and put away all that was on the altar—*sacrificia reponere*. In Lent Mass was sung after None, and a very brief space being left at the end of Mass the solemn chant of Vespers began.

According to the text of the Rule, Vespers were to be said at such time as to leave a sufficient interval for the brethren to get through the few remaining duties of the day without needing the light of a lamp. The hour of Vespers would then be about five in summer, and as early as half-past three in winter. The interval between None and Vespers was employed in reading in

the winter months, and in manual labour during summer. In Lent, as Warnfrid puts it, "None is sung, then Mass, and then follows a brief interval until Vespers. After Vespers: on fasting-days, out of Lent, a brief interval, a quarter of an hour's reading of the lives of the Fathers, Compline, and to bed." On other days, the reading was preceded by the evening collation. The very term "collation," now in universal use to signify the slight evening refection taken on a fast-day, comes from the *Collationes* or Conferences of the Fathers of the Desert, which was read before Compline. One of the books used for this reading before Compline—dating from about the eighth century—is preserved in the archives of the Proto-Monastery at Subiaco. The close of the day is thus regulated in the "Antiquus Ordo:"

Let them go very cautiously to the dormitory, and when a brother has reached his own bed, as he is lying down let him say the Psalm: *Deus in adiutorium* with *Gloria*, and then the verse, "Pone Domine custodiam ori meo," &c., and thus let him fortify himself with the sign of the Holy Cross and sleep in the Lord. Amen.

So far, we have sketched in outline the daily order of a monk's life. Passing on to other questions—how were they clad, housed, and fed? What were their usual studies and their manual labour? Then would come the ceremonial of the cloister. How were they governed? Had they intervals of rest from their daily toil? &c. The subject is far too vast to be dealt with in the narrow limits allowed me, and it will be better to take only such points as can be dealt with satisfactorily, and leave others to some future opportunity.

What then was the form of the ancient habit of a Benedictine monk? what was its colour? what its material? St. Benedict speaks of the tunic, scapular, cowl, girdle, shoes, stockings, ("pedules et caligæ") *bracile*, drawers, and handkerchief (*mappula*). Foreseeing the spread of his Order he expressly indicates that more than this is likely to be needed in colder climates than the one in which he lived; and in all cases things are to be so regulated that all excuse or complaint of wanting anything really needful be cut off. Monks must not complain of the coarseness of material, but must take what is in use where they live or can be got cheapest. Clothes must not be worn to the last extremity, but must be laid up in the wardrobe whilst they are still good enough to be given to the poor. They must have a change of tunic and cowl for the nights and for cleanliness, and when they go abroad must wear better clothes than they do at home. In a word, the whole text of St. Benedict points to one conclusion, a conclusion confirmed by the names of the garments, which were those used by the Italian peasantry of his day. The clothes he gave his monks were good and

plain, the garb, not of the rich, but of labouring men, but not sordid or such as might bring their profession into contempt, to guard against which, he bids them wear somewhat better clothes than usual when obliged to mix with seculars. Now let us come to each garment in particular, always bearing in mind that in St. Benedict's own time, as ever in the Church, the habit of a monk was "*sanctæ conversationis habitus*," and as such was received in the words of the monastic ceremonial as a symbol of innocence and humility, a garment chosen by our Fathers to make us like unto Him who chose to clothe Himself in our mortal flesh.

The tunic was at all times of the form now in use in the Order. Unlike the sleeveless tunics of the Egyptian monks, all the ancient representations of the Benedictine habit show it with sleeves. In all such representations the tunic descends in rather ample folds to the feet or at least to the ankles. St. Benedict insists on the garments of his monks not being short, and I have not yet lighted on any evidence of the short tunic, so common among the Roman peasantry, being used in monasteries.

No part of monastic dress has undergone such a vast change from its original shape as the cowl, *cuculla*. It was simply in its earliest form a cape with a hood attached reaching a little below the elbows. It was indifferently called *cucullus*, *cuculla*, or *cucullio*, by the Romans; was part of the labourer's costume, of coarse stuff and Gaulish origin, alluded to by Juvenal as the "*Venetus, durusque cucullus*" (Satire 3) and is the bardocucullus of Martial. Cassian, SS. Jerome, Ambrose, and Paulinus all speak of it as in common use with monks, while its sharp pointed hood is compared to the rolled up paper-bag in which the shopkeeper sells you incense or pepper :

Vel thuris piperisve sis cucullus.

The ancient paintings of St. Benedict show us the sharp-pointed hood rising high over his head. The "*cuculla*" was gradually lengthened till it had to be lifted up on the arms like the ancient chasubles—"a cowl is a chasuble" writes Paul Deacon in the eighth century—then holes were made for the arms. In St. Benedict of Anian's time it reached the knees, by the time of St. Dunstan it had taken its present size and form, and was a long wide-sleeved garment, as appears from St. Ethelwold's life and many sources.

Next we come to the scapular. This was simply a smaller and shorter cowl—that is, a hood and very short cape, more convenient for work than the other. Like the cowl, it was gradually lengthened, but was by almost universal custom left open at the sides and sleeveless. The Council

of Aix-la-Chapelle fixed its length at three feet, but it soon reached to the knees, and then to the feet. In the oldest representations it was not confined by the girdle. In the tenth century at Monte Cassino it had its present shape, but did not reach below the knees, as appears from paintings in some MSS. of that date. The front and back pieces were united by bands under the arms, after the actual Carthusian usage. An inextricable confusion has been caused by some authors calling both scapular and cowl *cuculla*, others very rightly distinguish between the *cuculla major* and the *cuculla minor*.

Of what material were the garments made? The Rule says only "of such as can be procured at a cheap rate;" though at a very early period linen was forbidden in the Order, and the monastic habit was made of wool. The Egyptian monks used linen.

Now we come to the vexed question of the colour of the original Benedictine habit. Laying aside a few instances of the use of grey or brown, as with Cistercian lay-brothers, or as seen in the habit of St. Boniface at Fulda, or among the monks of Savigny, who held sway at Buckfast for a very brief period, we have the rival claims of black and white to consider. St. Benedict expressly leaves the question of colour to be settled by convenience. There is a consensus that from the earliest days the scapular was usually of a dark colour, and I think the weight of evidence is in favour of the same for the cowl, though not perhaps quite so strongly. The question turns mainly on the tunic. In France the white colour prevailed in the earlier ages. It was that used by St. Benedict of Anian, and, according to Mabillon, by St. Maurus and first monastic apostle of his country. The Egyptian monks, to whom St. Benedict repeatedly alludes, wore a white tunic. On the other hand, the monastic apostles of England and their successors seem to have always worn the black habit, which at a very early date prevailed at Monte Cassino. In the conflict of authorities, I may perhaps hazard a conjecture. St. Benedict, from his love of simplicity, used a tunic of undyed wool, probably of a greyish tint; after the destruction of Monte Cassino, the monks who took refuge in Rome adopted the black colour in use in St. Gregory's monasteries. By St. Gregory's monks it was brought to England, where it served perhaps as one more point of rivalry in the contest with the white-robed Keltic monks, and through the universal respect for Roman usages, it eventually became the prevailing colour in the Order. Such Reforms as were less immediately connected with Rome preferred the white, which they thought a nearer approach to St. Benedict's original garb. In Paul Warnfrid there is a passage in which, commenting on St. Benedict's text, he says that monks

ought not to complain if the stockings are white and the tunic dark. I more than half suspect that the practice enjoined by the Cassinese Declarations, to wit, that the tunic be black and stockings white, was in vigour in Paul's time—*i.e.*, in the eighth century, and possibly much earlier.

What were the shoes and stockings of the ancient monks like? As regards stockings, nothing very certain can be laid down. In the eighth and ninth centuries, according to Warnfrid and Hildemar, the *pedules* were simply what we should call trunk hose. The custom of having different kinds of shoes for work and for the house was universal. The form varied from the sandals that are depicted in the Cassinese MS. to the boots reaching above the knee described in the Customs of Farfa and of St. Benignus at Dijon. The hobnailed shoes used when working in the fields are often alluded to. Paul Warnfrid says that grease for greasing the shoes is to be kept in a vessel where every one can get at it; but, he adds very naively, if it turns that someone steals it, it will be best to give each one a quantity to himself. There were fixed days for the greasing of the shoes, just as Tuesday was the day for the beginning of the week's washing.

The *bracile* was a broad girdle worn under the habit next the loins. Sometimes a leathern belt, sometimes a hempen girdle was in use. Woollen shirts were ordered to be worn by St. Benedict of Anian for reasons of climate, and whenever black dyed cloth for the tunic came into use, being inconvenient for washing, white woollen underclothing followed it, as at Cluny and elsewhere. The monks slept on palliasses; their coverings were sometimes of wool, often of skins of animals.

One word as to the monastic tonsure. Three forms of tonsure were known to our forefathers: the Eastern, which shaved the whole head; the Scoto-Irish, which shaved the front of the head from ear to ear, leaving the hair long and flowing on the occiput; and the Roman, which left a crown of hair round the head. The use of the razor for the head was not universal at first; in many places it was the distinctive mark or privilege of such as were in holy orders to have the head shaved with the razor.

Now I come to another important point in monastic customs—namely, how were Benedictine monasteries built? Uniformity in this respect is so carefully guarded, in such widely different localities, and from such an early date, that I have no hesitation in believing that on this point our monastic traditions are derived from the directions of the great monastic lawgiver himself, as they are strikingly convenient for the exercises of the monastic rule. The main lines are everywhere the same, except when some peculiar feature in the site chosen for building necessitated

a departure from them. The church built east and west, with the choir in front of the high altar, lies to the north of the monastic buildings. Had it lain to the south, its great height would have shut out warmth and sunlight from the cloister. The monastic offices are distributed round the cloister, whose four sides are built according to the points of the compass. On the west side are the porter's lodge and guest-rooms; on the south, the kitchen and refectory; on the east, the principal hall is the chapter-house, running east and west like the church, with a stone bench round it. The dormitory and library are above the east and south cloisters. The north gallery of the cloister abuts on the church, and as most of the day's work is done in community, the covered gallery running round the cloister is a convenient means for going processionally from one office to another. The monks in summer sat and read in the cloister; in winter, St. Dunstan orders that they should have a hall to serve as calefactory, opening off the cloister, probably on the east side, next to the chapter-house. This is all I intend to say on monastic buildings, and will only remark in conclusion that at every epoch in Benedictine history, and never more than when monasteries were governed by saints and monks led lives of extreme austerity, a never-failing instinct led them to rear buildings of chaste simplicity, but of surpassing loveliness. I know of no better examples than the remains we possess of Cistercian architecture within the first hundred years from St. Bernard. As the author of a book on monastic architecture, that mingles many errors with much that is just and true, observes—

In monastic architecture all is seemly and noble. . . . We do not pass from vaulted aisles to sheds and hovels. In stone halls, as seemly as the builder's art could make them, were the poor, hungry bodies fed and the weary limbs laid to sleep; the very kitchens were massive and picturesque, and wise design and honest work were not thought out of place in even humbler offices.

And thus in the lessons for the Office on the Feast of St. Victor III., we read in our breviary that he built the abbey church of Monte Cassino so that it seemed to be a "*reclinatorium angelorum*." And precisely as monastic observance relaxed, the chaste and noble seemliness of the house of God gave place to a corrupt and vicious taste for flimsiness and overloaded ornament, often more profane than sacred, and uninspired by the religious symbolism that is the breath of life of religious art. But this is a digression, and if any one wishes to observe the unity of plan in monastic buildings, he has only to place side by side

half a dozen ground plans of monasteries, as far apart in time and place as St. Gall or Westminster, Fleury or Buckfast, and in every case let him take as his starting-point the west wall of the south transept. This wall prolonged gives the wall of the eastern gallery of the cloister, leading to the chapter-house.

And now as to monastic fare. They ate twice a day when it was not a fast-day; once only on fast-days. The use of meat was allowed to the sick and infirm, as well as to the aged and to children: to all others it was forbidden. From the fact that St. Benedict in his prohibition specifies the flesh of quadrupeds, the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle allowed the flesh of fowls at Christmas and Easter, a practice in use at Monte Cassino in the eighth century. By some sort of tacit agreement, this interpretation of the rule, never a universal one, seems to have been condemned, and abstinence from the flesh of fowls observed with the same strictness as from that of quadrupeds throughout the Order about a century later. All congregations founded under the rule of St. Benedict, which profess to retain abstinence, exclude both alike. It is otherwise with regard to the practice of cooking dishes with lard or the fat of animals, a custom almost universally adopted within the period to which we are confining ourselves. St. Benedict of Anian, St. Dunstan, the Cluniacs, are at one on this point. The Fathers of Aix-la-Chapelle forbid the use of it on all Fridays, and St. Dunstan does not allow it in Advent, except on feast-days; in Lent it was forbidden. A very good idea of monastic fare is given us by Warnfrid's Commentary. St. Benedict allowed at dinner, bread, two cooked dishes, and fruit; at supper, the third part of the pound of bread. The good Lombard first justly remarks that the word *pulmentum* is used in the Latin translation both of the Old and New Testament, and signified at St. Benedict's time any kind of food besides bread. In the present instance it means vegetables, fish, cheese, &c., but not flesh. Then he goes on:

On ordinary days, if the heat or labour are not excessive, there should be two cooked dishes and one uncooked at Sext. At supper, if they sup, there should be one cooked dish; and as St. Benedict ordered two-thirds of a pound of bread to be given at dinner and one at supper, so likewise ought we to understand concerning the *pulmenta*.

Hildemar expressly includes eggs among the items of monastic fare. Warnfrid adds that on feast-days or at times of excessive labour, three cooked dishes and one uncooked one were allowed at Monte Cassino at dinner, and repeats the same in his letter to Charles the Great. There can be little question though, that Mabillon is right in saying that during the first ages of our

Order, the ordinary food consisted of bread and vegetables, and that fish and eggs, though not forbidden, were deemed more or less an indulgence to be allowed on certain days. The later Cluniacs only allowed fish twice a week; cheese or eggs were allowed on other days, but only in one dish; the other was of vegetables only, beans being everywhere the favourite food of monks. The Cluniac usage was already a decided mitigation of the rigour of earlier days such as observed by St. Benedict of Anian and his first disciples, with whom everything beyond bread and vegetables was an exceptional feast. During Lent, of course, only one meal was allowed, and that after Vespers. At this season the customs of Fleury command that on all Wednesdays and Fridays nothing is to be eaten with bread but raw herbs; beans or something of the kind on other days, to which the cellarer is to add fish on Sunday, Tuesday, and Thursday. These details will give a general idea of the somewhat variable austerity in food in early Benedictine times. A knotty problem is that of the real meaning of a pound of bread and the *hemina* of wine allowed by St. Benedict. The Cassinese editors of Paul Deacon have given us in their preface the best essay that has yet appeared on the subject. The measure of the pound of bread now extant at Monte Cassino, consisting of a brass weight with the inscription, "Pondus libri Panis Beati Benedicti," can be traced back as described by Peter the Deacon in the beginning of the twelfth century to Abbot Bonitus, who took it with him to Rome when the abbey was burned by the Lombards in the time of Pope Pelagius. The inscription in letters of silver was placed on it by Gregory II. The weight of bread is 1053 grammes, or over two pounds. Is this really the measure intended for one person, or had our forefathers, working in the fields as they did, such powerful appetites?

A more serious difficulty arises with regard to the measure of wine. The ancient Cassinese Declarations expressly declare that the *hemina* of wine preserved at Monte Cassino is more than enough for the ordinary wants of one monk in a day. Yet the size of the *hemina* is confirmed by the Kremsmunster cup, which dates from St. Tassilo's time in the eighth century, and from several other authorities. As the aforesaid measure of wine is pretty nearly two quarts, I must leave it undecided whether it is the *hemina* intended by St. Benedict for each one's consumption or not rather a measure of two *heminae*. St. Benedict is explicit in drinking very sparingly, and by ancient rule in Monte Cassino wine was always to be mixed with water.

With these four heads of ancient monastic discipline—to wit, the arrangement of hours, the food, clothing, and dwellings of monks, I must bring this article to its close. It would be useless to

attempt saying anything on monastic liturgy and ceremonies ; to make of it a useful essay it would have to be treated separately. It may astonish some to see that in the circle of monastic duties, our earliest Fathers allotted no special place to mental prayer. But the whole life of the monk was in their idea but one round of prayer, and the continuous silence (another subject that needs special discussion), as we find no hour in the day allotted for recreation, made it far less needful then than it now is, to assign special times for recollection. How, again, was maintained between the brethren that fraternal charity, the exuberant overflowing whereof is so frequent a theme in the lives of our monastic saints and of their disciples, and which drew such countless thousands to the cloister ; and what was the range of monastic studies ; and how were monks received and professed ; and what the care taken of the sick ; and what were the regulations for health and cleanliness, are among the subjects that would have more or less interest for students of our monastic history.

It was always a belief among our forefathers, and, I think, a well-grounded one, that the text of the Rule, if carried out in its entirety, adding nothing to it and taking nothing from it, was singularly discreet in its provisions, and adapted to all classes of men. St. Hildegarde writes :

He was a sealed-up spring, which poured forth its waters with the wisdom of God's discretion, clinching the sharp nail of His teaching neither too high nor too low, but in the very centre of the wheel, so that every one, weak as well as strong, could easily drink of it, according to the measure of his strength.

ADAM HAMILTON, O.S.B.

ART. VI.—THE PORTUGUESE IN INDIA.

1. *An Historical and Archæological Sketch of the City of Goa.* By JOSÉ NICOLAU DA FONSECA. Bombay : Thacker & Co. 1878.
2. *Les Possessions Portugaises dans l'Extrême Orient.* Par CHARLES GRÉMAUX. Paris : Challamel Aîné. 1883.
3. *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.* By HENRY JAMES COLERIDGE, S.J. London : Burns & Oates. 1881.
4. *Historia do Descobrimento e Conquista da India pelos Portugueses.* Por FERNÃO LOPEZ DE CASTANHEDA. Lisboa. 1883.

THE Iberian Peninsula, constituted by nature warden of the straits that lead from the outer to the inner seas, claimed in the fifteenth century to own, by right of pre-emption, the

new worlds its sons had made known. Rodrigo Borgia, himself a Spaniard, when reigning in 1493 as Pope Alexander VI., drew a meridian on the globe in the longitude of the Cape de Verde Islands, and, with a hemisphere in either hand, awarded them to Spain and Portugal respectively, as the prizes of maritime discovery. Yet, so rapidly did the ambition of conquest overpass even the vast limits thus assigned to it, that the pretensions of the rival powers clashed ere many years, at the opposite point of the earth's circumference, and the possession of the Molucca Islands, 160 degrees east of the original line of demarcation, was hotly contested between them.

A condition was attached to the gift of the bisected universe, that of propagating over its surface the tenets of the Catholic faith; and this stipulation of the title-deeds of dominion was, in its primary sense, scrupulously observed. The missionary accompanied the pioneer, and the conquests of the cross went hand-in-hand with those of the sword. But the victors of the latter, while carrying with them Christian doctrine, left behind Christian morality: they adopted the vices, while denying the rights, of the conquered; and the lustre of their achievements was dimmed by the records of their cruelty, their rapacity, and their excesses.

Thus, even at their Belshazzar's feast of luxury and prodigality, the dread handwriting of doom was already tracing the flaming sentence of retribution. Castilian and Lusitanian alike were weighed in the balance and found wanting, and the splendid inheritance of both fell to another race, whose sturdier virtues have better borne the strain of universal dominion. The Anglo-Saxon, the heir of Columbus in the West, as of Gama in the East Indies, has wielded, not unworthily, the lapsed sceptre of the seas, and England, holding in her hand a leash of empires that girdles the globe, dispenses equal justice to three hundred million freemen of all tribes and tongues from the rising to the setting of the sun.

The meteor empire of Portugal fell from its own inherent corruption. Born of the epic age of a nation, it decayed with the heroic qualities that had called it into being, and crumbled as rapidly as it had grown. Enervated by vice, deteriorated by climate, debased by contact with an enslaved population, the once imperial race effaced itself by assimilation of the lower elements around it. Indiscriminate intermarriage produced a people of swarthy mongrels, in whom the European type is absolutely obliterated in the third generation, rendering the descendants of the proud fidalgos indistinguishable from those of their hookah-lighters and palanquin-bearers. Political decadence necessarily accompanied physical degeneracy, and the

few existing fragments of the vast maritime dominion of Portugal, with its "five thousand leagues of coast," survive but among the *memento mori* of history, to point the moral of the instability of human greatness.

The purely nautical character of Portuguese rule was indeed a main cause of its ephemeral span of duration. Nowhere did the conquerors seek to extend their possessions inland, and, like the mangrove, they may be said never to have taken root out of reach of the tidal wash. The country in their rear was ignored by them, and their settlements remained isolated posts, maintaining their communications by water alone. The barrenness of the element they depended on for existence attended all their conquests; and their cities, mere depôts for sea-borne trade, remained excrescences on the soil whence they had sprung. Commercial, not colonial, extension, was the ideal of Portuguese rule, and commercial corruption was the canker-worm that sapped it at the root.

Trade with the East, ever the foundation of political greatness in Europe, had flowed, down to the voyage of Bartholomew Diaz, in two main channels. The first led from Central Asia, across Persia, to the great emporium of Byzantium; the second, from the ports of India and the Persian Gulf to those of the Red Sea, and thence overland to Alexandria, with the Arabs as its principal carriers eastward, and the Venetians westward of the Nile. The Roman Empire in the time of Pliny received from India goods valued at 550 million sesterces (about £1,400,000) a year, mainly consisting of precious commodities of small bulk, sold in Europe for one hundredfold their original price. Spices and drugs, such as frankincense, cassia, and cinnamon, used as incense in worship, and as embalming compounds in funeral rites, were among the principal imports, the remainder consisting of precious stones, pearls, and silk, the latter valued, in the time of Aurelian, at half its weight in gold. The introduction of silkworms into Europe in the reign of Justinian, by two Nestorian monks, who smuggled the eggs in the hollow of a cane, undermined this trade, which had previously been monopolized by Persia.

The idea of an ocean route to India, fermenting in men's minds through the Middle Ages, was the great stimulus of nautical enterprise among the rival powers on the Atlantic seaboard. The problem missed by Columbus, in a failure more glorious than success, was partially solved by Bartholomew Diaz, who, in 1487, first sighted the extremity of the great African peninsula, but despaired of the possibility of navigating the seas beyond. With a juster prescience of the imports of the discovery, John II., the monarch to whom it was reported,

altered the name of Cabo Tormentoso, "Cape of Storms," conferred by the navigator on the southern point of Africa, to that of "Cape of Good Hope," regarding it as the visible sign-post of the road to India.

Yet when Vasco da Gama, ten years later, collected his little fleet of three sloops of war, the largest but 120 tons, and prepared to sail from Lisbon Roads to the undiscovered East, he and his brother adventurers were regarded as men who had devoted themselves to death. The night previous to their departure was spent in the seaside chapel of Belem (Bethlehem), in solemn prayers and offices, and on the morrow (July 8, 1497) the navigators were accompanied to their ships by a procession of chanting clergy and choristers, while a vast multitude lined the beach, weeping and lamenting over their certain doom. The voyage that ensued is doubly memorable in the annals of literature and of geography, since it not only made known the coast of India, where the port of Calicut was reached on May 20, 1498, but furnished the muse of Camoens with the theme of "*Os Lusíades*," the national epic of Portugal.

A series of expeditions followed that of Gama. The first, which sailed in 1500, is remarkable for having blundered on an Empire. Its Commander, Pedro Alvarez Cabral, having steered too far to the west, sighted some high land previously unknown, landed, erected a *pádrao*, or commemorative column, and thus accidentally took possession of the great region of Brazil.

An inconclusive period of squabbles, skirmishes, and alliances followed, in which the littoral princes of Hindostan, the Zamorin* of Calicut, and the Kings of Cochin, Diu, and Cananor, were alternately played off against each other. An active phase of conquest was certain to follow this tentative one of exploration, and events only waited the advent of the controlling genius who should direct them. The destined founder of the Portuguese empire in the East appeared in due time in the hero historically pre-eminent among his peers by the title of "the Great" Alfonso d'Albuquerque.

Born in 1453, the Lusitanian Cortes was fifty years of age when he sailed on his first voyage to the East. He then occupied a subordinate position, but three years later, when starting, in 1506, on his second Indian expedition, he carried with him, unknown to himself, his patent as viceroy of the Indies in a sealed envelope, to be opened only at the end of three years, when Francisco d'Almeida's term of office should have expired.

The genius of the great captain grasped at once the governing fact of the political situation, and recognized that foreign com-

* Said to be a corruption of the Telugu word, "*Samrat*," a sovereign.

petition rather than native hostility was the chief element of danger to the commercial enterprises of Portugal. The Arabs, indiscriminately termed Moors by Christian historians because Mohammedan in religion, had from time immemorial been the brokers of the East, and, in the chain of seaports girdling the Indian Ocean, either exercised sovereign power or occupied a position of commercial supremacy. To the latter category belonged Calicut, where Vasco da Gama had narrowly escaped destruction from their intrigues, and to the former Ormuz and Aden, sentinels respectively of the Persian and Arabian Gulfs.

But it was not alone the vested interests of the Arab traders that were imperilled by the Portuguese discoveries. The principal revenue of Egypt, derived from dues—five per cent. on entrance and ten on export—levied on merchandise in transit from the East, was threatened with annihilation, while the entire trade of Venice was equally imperilled. The latter State consequently subsidized an alliance between the Soldan of Egypt and the Zamorin of Calicut for combined action against the interlopers, and a fleet built at Alexandria with materials supplied by the Republic of the Lagoons, was transported on camel-back across the Desert, and launched at Suez on the Red Sea. Nothing, indeed, but the subsequent disturbed state of politics in Europe prevented the enterprising citizens of Venice from executing their project of a canal from Cairo to the Gulf of Suez, thus reviving the enterprise of Pharaoh Necho, and anticipating that of De Lesseps.

Equally grandiose designs, destined to equal futility, were revolved by Albuquerque. One was the desolation of Egypt by the diversion of the Nile through Abyssinia, with the assistance of the Negus, then identified with Prester John; the other, nothing less than such an heroic feat of body-snatching as the rape of Mohammed's coffin from Medina, depriving Islam of one of its two great centres of fanaticism.

Uneasy and insecure as yet was the Portuguese position on the coast of Hindostan, where the viceroy, d'Almeida, was embroiled with the native princes. His rule had done little to raise the reputation of his countrymen, and his death, in 1509, in a skirmish with Kaffirs on the coast of Africa during his homeward voyage, was regarded as a retribution for the barbarous execution of his prisoners, blown from the guns at Cananor, as well as for his other cruelties and oppressions.

His withdrawal left a free hand to Albuquerque, whose policy had run in many respects counter to his own. The new viceroy desired to extend the Portuguese dominion by the occupation of an increased number of points along the littoral, and cast his eye on the great prize of the Malabar coast as the foundation

stone of the empire of his dreams. Goa, situated on an island in the estuary of the Mandavi river, at the foot of the Western Ghats, had long been recognized as a great commercial centre, and was now the chief emporium of Southern India. Its ruler, a Mohammedan prince, whose lengthy appellation—Adul Muzaffer Yusuf Adil Shah—is usually merged in the more compendious title of the Savai or Sabaio, from Sava, the place of his education, was the hero of a career of romantic vicissitudes such as are only recorded in Oriental annals. Born in the purple, the son of Sultan Amurath II., his early years were spent in slavery, his mother having, on the death of his father, in 1451, surreptitiously bestowed him on a Persian merchant, as the only means of saving him from the family massacre which in the East usually inaugurates a new reign. His master, Kwaja Imad-ed-din, carried him with him to the town of Sava, whence, at the age of seventeen, he was warned by a dream to betake himself to Southern India.

Here, though servitude was again his portion, he rose rapidly in the favour of his new master, Kwaja Mohammed Gawan, vizier of one of the princes of the Deccan, and captor of Goa, which he had taken in 1469. His young slave first distinguished himself as a soldier in the royal body-guard, and finally rose to the status of an adopted son. Appointed governor of Daulatabad, and afterwards of Bijapur, he was, in 1489, crowned king of the latter principality, which became, under him, an independent State, with Goa as its commercial capital.

This royal changeling ought to have proved a formidable antagonist even for Albuquerque, but when the latter, with a fleet of twenty sail of the line and 1,200 fighting men, appeared off the mouth of the Mandavi in 1510, superstition had already paved the way for his triumph. A yogi, or inspired seer, had foretold the capture of the city by foreigners from beyond the seas, and the prediction secured its own fulfilment. Eight of the principal citizens went to present the keys to the invader, the Sabaio withdrew without a struggle, and Albuquerque found himself master of Goa, which he entered in triumph under a rain of gold and silver filigree flowers from windows and balconies. But the halcyon days of this easy conquest were of brief duration. Adil Shah returned at the head of an army, and, on May 23, 1510, recaptured the city and drove the invaders to their ships. The Portuguese, cut off from the shore, soon began to suffer the horrors of famine, being reduced to devouring rats and all such loathsome food, but Albuquerque held on to Goa with the grip of a bulldog on the part where he has once fastened his teeth. His opponent, desirous of tempting him to betray his condition, sent out a boat laden with the most

delicate provisions, but the great captain's spirit was equal to the emergency. Ordering the wine and biscuit reserved for the sick to be displayed in festive array on deck, he bade the enemy take back his supplies, as the Portuguese were revelling in luxury.

Such tenacity could not but prevail in the end. Reinforcements arrived, bringing up the Portuguese strength to twenty-eight ships with 1,700 men, and on St. Catherine's Day, Nov. 25, the town was carried, after an obstinate defence, in which 2,000 of the enemy fell. The victory was stained by the indiscriminate massacre of the Mussulman population, and "Goa's purpled shore" was ensanguined with the blood of 6,000 victims—men, women and children. Albuquerque, who, like many of his countrymen, combined piety with ferocity, vowed a church to St. Catherine in honour of his blood-stained triumph, and the plunder of the city furnished him with the means of keeping faith with his patroness. The nominal fifth of the spoil reserved for the Crown amounted to £20,000, but this sum represented a very much smaller proportion of the booty really appropriated. No time was lost in securing the new conquest by the erection of forts at all vulnerable points, while palaces and churches sprang up with equal rapidity. Albuquerque, who desired his soldiers to become colonists, encouraged them to marry native women, summarily baptized, of course, as a preliminary, giving promotion and appointments to those who did so, a policy which, however expedient at the time, conduced eventually to the physical and moral degeneracy of the colony.

Goa thus made safe, he turned his eyes in the year following to an equally tempting prey, whose possession conferred the key of the sea-gate of China. Malacca, the City of the Straits, was then a great mart, throned on the threshold of the East, and sated with Asiatic vice and luxury. The capital of an independent Mohammedan State, with a population of 100,000, it held out but nine days against Albuquerque's band of 1,400 heroes, despite a power of resistance testified to by 3,000 pieces of ordnance captured, in addition to those carried off by the retreating Moors.

Given up to pillage, it yielded vast booty, yet at the lapse of a few months had regained more than its former prosperity, and become the second jewel in the crown of Lusitanian conquest. It is thus apostrophized by Camoens, in celebrating the deeds of Albuquerque :—

Nor shalt e'en thou escape a like mishap ;
 In vain thy wealth—thy dawn-wrapt site in vain—
 Aurora's nursling, cradled in her lap—
 Malacca, well-styled opulent—the rain
 Of venom'd darts that doth thy foes enwrap
 Shall help thee not, nor lances hurled amain ;

And Java's hardy sons, Malay impassioned,
Shall to the Lusitanian yoke be fashioned.

"Lusiads," canto x. stanza lxiv.

The next conquest was due to one of those happy accidents, happily availed of, which chance only to heroes in a heroic age. The stratagem by which a shipwrecked Portuguese crew, under Antonio d'Abrea, turned the tables on a band of Malay pirates engaged in plundering their vessel, led to the discovery, in 1512, of the fragrant archipelago of the Moluccas. For the castaways, emerging from an ambushade, and possessing themselves of the corsairs' ship, the latter offered to ransom it by guiding the strangers to a rich and favoured isle. This proved to be Amboyna, and the Portuguese, by taking sides in a native war then going on, gained a permanent footing there.

The taking of Ormuz in 1515 was the last exploit of the great captain. This island city, the trysting place of all the motley populations of Asia, was so famed for its splendour that an Eastern saying declares that "if the world be a ring Ormuz is its jewel," and so notorious for its evil manners, that pious writers wondered they did not draw down such a fiery retribution as overwhelmed the Cities of the Plain. Miraculous intervention was supposed to have facilitated its conquest, which is narrated as follows in the "Lusiads":—

But lo! in meteor blaze see shine afar
The arms of Albuquerque, which shall tame
The Parsis of Ormuz, o'er-brave to war,
'Gainst yoke so mild, subjection void of shame.
There shall be seen shafts sped with strident jar,
Wheel round in air and fly reversed in aim
'Gainst those who hurled them, for the skies fight ever
For those who to extend Christ's faith endeavour.
Nor there shall mounts of salt suffice to save
From fell decay the bodies slain in fight,
Which shall the strand encumber, strew the wave
By Khargun, Muscat, and Khelayat's bight.
Thus shall they learn from force they may not brave
To bow the neck and tribute yield of right.
The homage of their impious realm to measure,
In pearls of Orient Bahrein's, lucid treasure.

"Lusiads," canto x. stanzas xl. and xli.

The ruler of Ormuz, Seif-ed-din (Sword of Religion), was compelled to pay a yearly tribute of 15,000 xeraphins,* and allow the conquerors to erect a fort in his dominions, which, with another at Socotra, placed them in a commanding position,

* The xeraphin is 200 reis, about 1fr. 20c., the milreis being 5fr. 60c.

astride of the road to India. The conquest of the City of Pearls crowned and closed the career of Albuquerque, but did not avail to sweeten his last moments, over-shadowed by remorse for all the bloodshed he had caused. He died at Goa, in December 1515, and was buried in the church he had raised to St. Catherine, in honour of his victory there. The inscription on the threshold (*Y quien mas hizierepasse a delante*) bids him who has done more take precedence of him, but a more touching tribute to his grave was long paid in the flower-offerings and prayers of the Hindoos, who thus invoked as a protector against oppression the shade of one always remembered by them as a beneficent ruler. The portrait of the great captain, hung with those of the other Viceroy in the Council Hall of Goa, represents him as a man of sad and cadaverous aspect, with weary lustreless dark eyes, and exaggerated length of nose and jaw, clad in the same style of costume which we are accustomed to associate with the very different physiognomy of bluff King Hal.

Unscrupulous as to the means by which he carried out his great designs, the memory of Albuquerque, like that of most commanders of his day, is stained by many dark and treacherous actions. Thus the brother of the zamorin was induced by him, in 1513, to poison that prince, the grant of a fort at Calicut to the Portuguese being the price of their connivance in the foul fratricide.

One of the victims of his cruelty had a strange story. A member of an unhappy band of Portuguese deserters, recaptured in the taking of Goa, he suffered, with his fellows, the barbarous sentence of mutilation. With the right hand amputated, the left deprived of two of its fingers, and otherwise gashed and disfigured, he was on his way to Europe, when, the ship having called for water at the then uninhabited island of St. Helena, he hid himself and remained behind. On some small supplies charitably left for his benefit, he contrived to exist, and, helpless as he was, scooped out a shelter or burrow for his nightly sleeping place. As he always concealed himself from the approach of visitors, these traces of mysterious habitation at first proved startling to callers at the island, but the story of the recluse becoming known, it grew to be a habit to land provisions and even goats and kids for his use. A cock, fallen overboard from a ship, rescued by him from the surf, and fed from his store of rice, became his constant companion, never leaving him day or night, and a Malay boy subsequently shared his solitude. He eventually attracted the attention of royalty, was brought home to Lisbon, visited by the king, and provided with a hermitage where he passed the remainder of his life as a reclaimed Robinson Crusoe.

The prestige bequeathed by Albuquerque to the Portuguese name contributed in no small degree to still further extension of dominion. Thus, within ten years after his death, his successors had explored the China Seas, sighted the Australian shores, visited New Guinea, planted themselves in all the principal islands of the Indian Archipelago, negotiated treaties with Bangkok and Peking, and won at Macao a permanent foothold in the jealously guarded dominions of the Son of Heaven. The Indian Ocean was girdled with their settlements on its eastern as well as on its western shores, and the fabled riches of the Oriental world were poured into the lap of Portugal. From all the harbours of Europe ships flocked to the mouth of the Tagus to distribute thence the products of the East, and the Lisbon merchants sold for almost their weight in gold the precious cargoes of their wave-beaten galleons and carracks.

But the centre of this sudden efflorescence of commercial prosperity was the newly won capital of Portuguese India, and the name of Goa Dourada, the Golden City of the East, became a synonym for luxury and opulence. "*Quem viô Goa excusa de ver Lisboa*" (he who has seen Goa may dispense with seeing Lisbon), said the proverb, and indeed the daughter city soon outshone the mother, even as Carthage did Tyre. Her quays were thronged by merchants from every part of Asia, from Armenia to Cathay, as well as by Venetians, Germans, Flemings, Castilians, and English. The sandal-wood of Java, the camphor of Borneo, the cinnamon and cloves of the Moluccas, the silks and porcelain of China, diamonds from Golconda, pearls from Bahrein, were landed on her wharves, and paid heavy toll to her prosperity. Capital was multiplied a hundredfold by a single voyage, and fortunes grew with mushroom-like rapidity. If legitimate commerce did not thrive, there were indefinite possibilities of pillage, and an unlimited supply of slave-labour absolved from toil the enervated European inhabitants.

Life was cheap in this sensuous paradise, where a man could maintain himself for one tonga or five sous a month, while amusement of a congenial kind was abundant in gaming-houses and exhibitions of jugglery and dancing. The counter influence of religion was visible in the presence of seventy or eighty churches and convents, and the treasures of the bazaars were lavished on the shrines. Window-panes of translucent oyster-shell, like those of modern Canton, screened the indoor privacy of the ladies, and gorgeous palanquins maintained their seclusion when they went abroad. White villas, peeping from the palm groves of the environs, gave rural tranquillity to the busy merchants, and breathing space to a population of 200,000 souls packed within the circuit of $3\frac{3}{4}$ miles of walls.

Fleets of merchantmen, sometimes numbering 240 sail, left the port in company for mutual protection, but were forbidden to engage in the spice trade, reserved as the monopoly of the Crown. This privileged branch of commerce, amounting to 30,000 quintals (3,840,000 lb.) annually, with a profit of £45,000 sterling, was subsequently transferred to the *Companhia das Indias Orientaes*, but this, like all successive attempts at a Portuguese East India Company, was driven from the field by the competition of the trading officials of Goa excluding all interlopers.

A powerful fleet kept the seas clear of pirates from September to April, but was laid up in dock during the summer months, which were a dead season. The military force embarked in it consisted of a sort of militia organized on a peculiar plan. The muster-roll of all entered in its several grades was kept in Portugal, but no pay was drawn by the men, nor was service obligatory. Proclamation was made, when the fleet was being fitted out, that a certain number of men were wanted, when such as wished to serve volunteered, taking the rank they occupied on the muster-roll. While unemployed, they lived at their own expense, forming a disorderly element of the population. All claimed the rank and title of *fidalgo*, whence they were called, contemptuously, "*fidalgos of the Cape of Good Hope*." Cards and dice were the solace of their ample leisure, and in the gaming-saloons of Goa the ill-got earnings were so lightly lost that the groups of three and four, who chummed together in bachelor quarters, frequently possessed but a single suit of clothes in common, and had to take turns for outdoor appearances. It may be easily imagined that neither manners nor morals benefited from the presence of this horde of dilapidated swashbucklers, who, used to all military licence, while subjected to no military discipline, were ready to hire themselves out for the most nefarious purposes.

Of the civilian society in Goa, ostentation and prodigality were, as in all purely commercial communities, the leading features. Early travellers vie in descriptions of the magnificence of the Portuguese magnates, and are never tired of marvelling at the pomp of their surroundings and the effeminacy of their manners, at their insolence and their splendour, their wealth and their prodigality. The *fidalgos*, we are told, did not stir abroad without a retinue of attendants to hold umbrellas over their heads, to fan them, or brush away the flies that molested them. As wheel-carriages were unknown, they were either carried by boyas in silk-cushioned palanquins, or rode horses, with gold and silver trappings, and reins studded with gems and hung with silver bells, while the stirrups were

of no baser metal than silver gilt. Yet these stately cavaliers were not ashamed to live on the earnings of their slaves, male and female, hired out, irrespective of all feelings of humanity, to the highest bidder.

When the Viceroy went abroad, which was only on rare occasions, he was attended by a train of these glittering courtiers.

A day previous to his appearance in public [says Da Fonseca] drums were beaten and trumpets sounded as a signal to the noblesse and the gentry to accompany him on the following day. Accordingly, early in the morning, about three or four hundred fidalgos appeared in the Terreiro do Paço, clad in rich attire, mounted on noble steeds with gold and silver trappings, glittering with pearls and precious stones, and followed by European pages in rich livery. With such a splendid cavalcade did the Viceroy show himself in public.

The Goanese ladies were no whit behind their consorts in the pomp and circumstance with which they surrounded themselves. The author last quoted gives an extract from an early writer, François Pyrard, describing the progress to church of an Indo-Portuguese dame of condition.

Rich and noble women [he says] go seldom to church except on the principal festivals, and when they do they appear richly dressed, after the fashion of Portugal, the dress mostly of gold and silver brocade adorned with pearls, precious stones, and with jewels on the head, arms, neck, and round the waist; and they put on a veil of the finest crape in the world, which extends from head to foot. Young maidens wear veils of different colours, whilst grown-up ladies invariably use black ones.

The stockingless feet of these shrouded dames were thrust into tiny slippers embroidered with gold and silver spangles, gems and seed-pearls, while a sole of cork, nearly half a foot in height, rendered the wearers almost as helpless on their feet as Chinese beauties. Their devotional outfit, taken into the church by Portuguese or Eurasian servants as soon as they descended from their richly adorned palanquins, included a valuable Persian carpet called *alcatifa*, which in Europe would be worth five hundred crowns, and two or three cushions of velvet or brocade, one for the head, another for the feet.

A number of servants and slaves [continues our author] follow them on foot, richly attired in silks of different colours, with large, fine crape over all, which they call mantos. But they do not dress after the European fashion, but clothe themselves with a large piece of silk which serves them as petticoats, and have also, smocks of the finest silk, which they call *bajas*. Among these slaves are seen very beautiful girls of all the races inhabiting India. And it is to be remarked that the ladies are also accompanied by pages, and by one or two Por-

tuguese or Eurasian gentlemen to assist them in alighting from the palanquin. Frequently, however, they are taken into the church in their palanquins, so much are they afraid of being exposed to the public view. They do not wear any masks, but paint their cheeks to a shameful degree. It is not that the ladies fear being seen, but they are forbidden by their husbands, who are too jealous of them. One of the servants or slaves brings a rich carpet; another, two costly cushions; a third, a china gilt chair; a fourth, a velvet case containing a book, a handkerchief, and other necessary things; a fifth, a very thin, beautiful mattress to be spread over the carpet; and a sixth, a fan and other things for the use of the mistress.

As already stated, these ladies, when they enter the church, are taken by the hand by one or two men, since they cannot walk by themselves on account of the height of the slippers, which are generally half a foot high, and have the upper part open. One of these presents holy water to the lady, and she goes afterwards to take her seat, some forty or sixty paces off, taking at least a good quarter of an hour to walk that distance, so slowly and majestically does she move, carrying in her hand a rosary of gold, pearls, and precious stones. This they do all do, according to their means, and not according to their quality.

Thus bedaubed and bedizened the attendance of a Eurasian dame at service must have tended rather to distract the devotion of others than to increase her own. Unless, indeed, they are sadly maligned, these ladies gave anything but an edifying sample of Christian manners to the heathen. The policy of Indo-Portuguese marriages, initiated by Albuquerque, proved fatal to the best interests of the colony, not only promoting the permanent adulteration of the race, but perpetuating that lower scale of morality which only the influence of European ladies could have helped to raise. The women of the settlement were necessarily coloured in varying degrees, and formed no exception to the rule according to which East Indian half-castes are an unmitigatedly vicious race. Christianity, hastily improvised for the purpose of marriage by the wives of the first colonists, was never perhaps perfectly acquired, and as religion may almost be said to be entailed in the female line, the influence of Christian motherhood was practically eliminated. Ignorant and isolated, surrounded with material luxury, yet devoid of mental culture, the Goanese ladies became rapidly learned in all the baser arts of the East. Adepts in the use of drugs and potions, they knew how to produce insensibility, temporary mental alienation, or death. It would scarcely have been safe for a Goanese lady to accept from a rival beauty a dish of those delicate conserves, or fruit candies, for whose preparation the Eurasian ladies were equally and more creditably famed. Neither did their husbands scruple

to avenge an insult or rid themselves of an enemy by the same means, poison, if we may trust travellers' tales, being resorted to by the viceroys themselves, while the venality of justice secured impunity for all crime committed by the noble or influential.

The money so lavishly spent was acquired by all forms of extortion and peculation. Thus 4,000 soldiers under pay figured on the rolls as 17,000, and the same rule of multiplication was doubtless applied to all branches of administration. Hence, it is not difficult to understand how viceroys frequently returned with £300,000 fortune, after a triennial term of rule, while governors and generals amassed £100,000, and minor officials from £20,000 to £50,000 each. A remarkable passage in the "*Soldado Pratico*," a work by a Portuguese writer, Diego da Couto, on the decadence of the Portuguese in India, says that no one who returned with wealth from the East ever kept it, that the money appeared to be excommunicated and disappeared as if it were enchanted, and that it went as it had come by infernal agency, seeing that most of it was coined from the blood of innocent people. When we remember that the African slave-trade also sprang from the same phase of society, for the record in the pages of Osorio, Bishop of Silves, of the annual importation of 10,000 or 12,000 negroes into Portugal previous to 1541, disproves the assertion that it was indirectly caused by Las Casas' exertions in favour of the Indians, we can indeed believe that a curse should have rested on the Portuguese empire in the East.

But one imperishable glory at least remains to it, as a set off against its many shortcomings. A fame that has survived the wreck of all its material splendour, haloes even to-day the melancholy capital of Portuguese India, and the East still thrills, after the lapse of three centuries, to the name, greater than that of any conqueror with the sword, of him who sleeps in Goa. Into that society, so corroded with vice and self-seeking, therestep, like a Presence from another world, the figure of the greatest Apostle of modern times, and, as in the dawn of creation, light forthwith was born of darkness. Francis Xavier, then in his thirty-seventh year, landed in Goa in 1542, and began that crusade owing to which, before ten years, 1,200,000 of the heathen had embraced Christianity. But his first efforts were directed to a reform of society in Goa itself, and his letters remain on record to prove how much it was required. In one addressed to Simon Rodriguez, Superior of the Jesuit Order in Lisbon, he warns him to let no one in whom he took an interest accept any financial post under the government in India, as the temptations were such as no virtue could resist. He then goes on to describe as

follows, the general debasement of the standard of honesty in India :—

Robbery is so public and common that it hurts no one's character, and is hardly counted a fault; people scarcely hesitate to think that what is done with impunity it cannot be bad to do. Everywhere and at all times it is rapine, hoarding, and robbery. No one thinks of making restitution of what he has once taken. The devices by which men steal, the various pretexts under which it is done, who can count? I never cease wondering at the number of new inflexions, which, in addition to all the usual forms, have been added in this new lingo of avarice to the conjugation of that ill-omened verb to "rob."*

To combat the evils rampant in this capital of the Mammon of unrighteousness, St. Francis brought rare gifts, even from a purely worldly point of view. The courtly breeding acquired in his ancestral castle near Pampeluna, the grace of manner conferred by a brilliant secular education, the geniality of his temper, the vivacity of his disposition, combined to give him a charm that the most hardened could scarce resist. An infinite patience and gentleness, a charity that could stoop to all personal humiliation to gain its ends, an infallible tact, an unflinching sympathy, were among the gifts of a reformer who may well be called the courtier of sinners. He insinuated himself into their affections, won their confidence, shared their pursuits, became the hearty comrade of the outlawed soldier, the sparkling table-companion of the callous worldling—then, when the hour of grace arrived, unmasked his batteries of religious persuasion, and compelled the most strongly intrenched fortress of iniquity to surrender at discretion.

The conversion of one noted sinner, whose life was a scandal even in Goa, was effected by a masterly strategy of silence. Appealing to his hospitality for a dinner, after a fashion not unusual with him, the Saint affected unconsciousness of the accessories of heathen licence and luxury. amid which the banquet was served, entertained his astonished host, who was momentarily expecting a denunciation, with the conversation of an accomplished man of the world, and took leave of him without a word of spiritual counsel. The pointed omission made a greater impression on the sinner than the severest homily would have done, he thought with horror that his case must indeed be hopeless if Francis thought him beyond rebuke or reclamation, and hastening to the feet of the Saint next day, he promised a reform of his way of life, which he carried into practice without delay.

* "Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier," Henry James Coleridge, S.J., p. 278.

On another occasion, Francis, in one of his many voyages, was the shipmate of a soldier ill-famed among adventurers of his class, as a notorious reprobate. To this man the once haughty Navarrese cavalier inseparably attached himself, seeking his constant society, patient of his rude conversation, tolerant even of his blasphemies. He would stand by him at the gaming-table, sharing to outward appearance his hopes and fears, rejoicing when he won, sympathizing when fortune turned against him, yet all the while playing himself for another stake, the soul of the abandoned outcast. At last the moment came when the subject of religion could be broached, and the man acknowledged that for eighteen years he had held aloof from its practices, and that when last, in Goa, he had attempted to make a confession, the priest had turned him away, horrified at the list of his iniquities. The benign saint declared that he, on the contrary, armed with the fullest powers to absolve and reconcile, would listen to the tale though it should last till Doomsday, and that at its conclusion, like good comrades, they would divide the penance between them. At the first landing-place touched at this amicable arrangement was acted on, and the rest of the ship's company, having collected from curiosity to watch the proceedings of the strangely assorted pair, learned with amazement, when the soldier had been shriven, that the recitation of a single *Pater* and *Ave* was the sole penance imposed on him. The mystery was solved by following the Saint to a wood, where he was found undergoing his share of expiation in the form of a severe flagellation, the contrition of his penitent being increased a hundredfold by the sight.

Another of these desperadoes, also associated with Francis in a sea-voyage, was saved by him from self-destruction, in a paroxysm of despair at the loss, at the gaming-table, of a large sum of money entrusted to him for a commission. While all present were horrified at his blasphemies and execrations, St. Francis, having borrowed among the bystanders sufficient for a stake, handed it to the man, saying, "Come, my friend, let us try our luck again." The stake was won, and while the Saint stood by, fortune so favoured his client that the trust-money was rapidly recovered and the suicide saved and converted.

Even the worldly concerns of his friends were matters of interest to the human kindness of the great apostle, and legends of his intervention on their behalf are rife in Goa. Thus Cosmo Añez, one of his intimates, having purchased a very valuable diamond on his own responsibility, and sent it to the king, Francis, becoming suddenly thoughtful one day at dinner, asked him the name of the vessel carrying it. "I should rather it had been any other," said he on being informed, where-

upon Añez, much alarmed, begged him to pray for its safety. A few days later, meeting his friend again, he bade him give thanks to Heaven, as the diamond was safe in the hands of the Queen. It subsequently transpired that the ship had been in danger of foundering from a leak, and the captain was about to run her on shore, when the water mysteriously ceased to gain, and the rest of the voyage was made in safety. To another merchant, returning home with valuable goods, Francis predicted a prosperous journey, bidding him in no extremity be prevailed on to throw his merchandise overboard. The warning was remembered when, during the voyage, the ship grounded, and the captain, wishing to lighten her by sacrificing the cargo, was deterred by the energetic protest of his passenger, who declared that he had the word of Francis to the contrary. On this statement he refrained, and his faith was rewarded a little later, by seeing his ship floated off uninjured by a very high tidal wave.

The anecdote of the horse tamed by the hand of St. Francis Xavier recalls, in its playful familiarity with nature, some of the legends of his earlier namesake, the Angel of Assisi. In passing through the streets of Goa, he saw a splendid barb, which, by rearing and plunging, offered the most violent resistance to the process of shoeing. Going up to it and caressing it with his hand, Francis addressed to it the playful remonstrance: "Brother horse, how is it that, so beautiful as you are, you will let no one put shoes on you?" The animal became tractable in a moment, and a quadruped was added to the list of the Xaverian converts.

Associated with the residence of the Saint in Goa is one of the most picturesque figures of the Portuguese conquest, that of the chivalrous Viceroy Joam de Castro, who died June 6, 1548, after two years and eight months of office. He is the hero of a celebrated anecdote which, despite its whimsicality, has a real place in history. It was after the relief of Diu, where his lieutenant, Mascarenhas, had been besieged for eight months by the forces of Rumeacan, the young King of Cambay, that the Viceroy, being pressed for money, sent to borrow £20,000 from the city of Goa on the security of one of his mustachios, which he sent as a pawn. The citizens not only responded to the appeal by sending the money and returning the pledge, but the ladies added the value of their jewels to the amount. This splendid satrap, who loved the glitter of his office, showed Goa a magnificent spectacle a little later, when he entered in quasi Roman triumph with 600 prisoners in his train, surrounded by the rich spoils of Eastern war. It was in reference to this display, that Donna Catalina, Queen of Portugal, remarked that "he had conquered like a Christian and triumphed like a heathen."

Such was his attachment to St. Francis, that he would not allow him to leave Goa during his last six months of life, and when his brilliant career came to an end it was in the arms of the Saint that he breathed his last. Many of the other Portuguese authorities were far from looking with equal favour on the work of the apostolate, and, despite the reform and conversion of many individuals in Goa, there is evidence that the feeling of the community was hostile to a movement which threatened to limit its tyranny by securing recognition for the rights of the oppressed natives. Many of the letters of St. Francis contain references to his griefs and vexations on this score, of which the following may serve as a specimen :—

To hear, as I do, that our Christians are persecuted and oppressed both by the heathen and by the Portuguese, is a thing which wounds my heart to the very core, so atrocious and so mischievous is it.

The kidnapping by the Portuguese of subjects of the native princes in whose dominions he was preaching often endangered the safety of his flock, and other arbitrary acts of violence brought the Christian name into disrepute.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, whole sections of the native populations adopted Christianity almost *en masse*, and in Travancore alone Francis founded forty-five churches, and made 10,000 converts in one month. In this district it is on record that the "Great Father," as he was called, went about barefooted, wearing an old black cap and a torn cassock, that his pulpit sometimes was a tree, and his altar canopy a rude shed made of the rails of boats. A singular feature of his apostolate was the use he made of children-catechists to instruct and convert others. Armed with a bead or crucifix worn by the Saint, these little neophytes are said to have worked miracles and even raised the dead in his name, converting whole villages by their teaching, and often burning the idols worshipped by their own parents.

The personal influence of St. Francis was very powerful even with the Brahmins, whose material interests were, however, too dear to them to be sacrificed to admitted truth. On one occasion, questioning one of them as to the secret tenets of his religion, the great Jesuit was much surprised to hear him repeat in a low voice, as though in reluctant admission, the familiar text of the Ten Commandments.

One of the most active companions of the Xavierian mission to Japan was a lay brother of the name of Joan Fernandez. This young man, a very rich silk merchant of Cordova, was, when in Lisbon, accidentally taken by a friend to hear the music in the Church of the Jesuits, and was suddenly seized

with a desire to join the Order. He applied to Father Simon Rodriguez for admission, but the latter, doubting his vocation, and knowing his fashionable antecedents, put him to a severe test by requiring him to ride, dressed as he was, down the principal street of Lisbon, seated on a donkey with his face to the tail. As the neophyte underwent this novel species of ordeal without flinching, he was accepted by the Superior, and eventually sent to the East, where his energy and capacity rendered him a most serviceable coadjutor.

The apostolic labours of St. Francis were comprised within a term of ten years. China was the Promised Land of his wanderings, and the island of Sancian his Mount Nebo, whence he was permitted to look on it only from the edge of the tomb. Thwarted to the last by the Portuguese authorities, and the object of the special hostility of the Governor of Malacca, he died here, lonely and abandoned, save by a solitary attendant, in a hut by the shore, on December 2, 1552. The fame of his sanctity grew and spread after his death, and his body, which had been hastily enclosed in a coffin, with a quantity of quicklime, was removed to Malacca in a ship called the *Santa Croce*. Prodiges attended its transit; the sick were healed by the touch of anything that had been in contact with it, and the plague, which was desolating Malacca, ceased when it entered the port on March 22, 1553.

The people of Goa coveted the possession of the precious relics, which were removed secretly by night, at the close of the year, and embarked on board a crazy ship, whose voyage, with many vicissitudes, lasted till March 15 following. Borne through the streets on the morrow—Passion Friday—between houses hung with rich tapestry and brocade, with smoke of incense and strewing of flowers, the dead Saint made his triumphal entry into Goa, and the coffin was deposited in the College of St. Paul, to the thunder of saluting forts and chime of pealing bells. The body, which long remained unaltered by decay, and is still in a state of comparative preservation, was at first freely exhibited to the people, but the difficulty of keeping order in the crowds that thronged to approach it, and of protecting it from the pious violence of relic-hunters, compelled its guardians to be more chary of showing it. It is now only visible on rare occasions in the Jesuit Church dedicated to the Infant Saviour, whither it was finally removed, and where it rests in a magnificent shrine, the object of veneration to Pagans and Christians alike.

The miracle by which Goa was saved from capture on November 24, 1683, was the occasion of the posthumous titles of Viceroy and Capitan Mor, or Captain-General of the Indies,

being conferred on the apostle and protector of Goa. A Maratha army had reached the island of Santo Estevão, separated from that of Goa only by a narrow creek, and all hope of saving the town seemed lost, when the Viceroy, the Count of Alvor, repaired to the shrine, and, depositing there his patent and staff of office, requested the Saint to accept the government and assume the protectorate of the city. This had scarcely been done, when a Moghul army was seen descending from the Ghats, and the enemy decamped without delay. Each succeeding governor since then takes from the hand of the silver statue of St. Francis the staff of Indian cane symbolical of his office, and replaces it by a new one, thus receiving his credentials as the gift of his saintly predecessor. Thrice only in the last hundred years—in 1782, in 1859, and in 1878—have the venerable relics been exhibited to the public gaze. On the last two occasions, the exposition, begun on December 2, lasted in 1859 till the 6th, and in 1878 till the 8th of January. The throng of pilgrims from all parts of India, reckoned at 200,000, was so continuous, that it was necessary to keep the church open day and night, and many conversions and miraculous cures were effected.

The Saint is visible in an upright position, enclosed in a glass coffin, clothed in rich vestments, with a cushion behind his head. The body has shrunk much in height, and little more than desiccated skin remains on the face and extremities, but the teeth and hair are well preserved, and the circle of the tonsure is very apparent. The right arm is wanting, as it was detached by order of the Pope on November 3, 1614, and divided into four portions, of which the principal was sent to Rome.

The memory of St. Francis is held in peculiar reverence by the natives of India, so much so that a mosque was dedicated to him on the west coast of Comorin, and a temple built in his honour by the Rajah of Travancore. It is only when pilgrims throng to his shrine that the desolate port of Goa is animated by anything like its former bustle, and that the decayed capital seems resuscitated to a memory of its departed glory.

Its decadence set in within twenty years of the death of Francis, and was inaugurated by the subdivision of the governments of the East under Don Sebastian in 1570. Three great provinces were then formed, that of Monomotapa, extending along the coast of Africa, between Capes Corrientes and Guardafui; that of India, comprised between Cape Guardafui and the island of Ceylon; and of Malacca, reaching from Pegu to China. The disaster of August 4, 1578, when Don Sebastian and the flower of his army perished on the African battlefield of Alcazar-

Kebir, gave the death-blow to the independence of Portugal, and the dominions of the Lusitanian Crown were two years later absorbed in those of Spain. The latter power paid little regard to the interests of the Eastern provinces, and when Portugal, by a successful revolution in 1640, recovered her national independence under John of Braganza, a few decaying settlements were all that remained of her magnificent colonial empire.

Formidable rivals had wrested away her commercial monopoly, the Dutch had driven her from the Moluccas in 1606, and in 1612 the company of English merchants, whose emulation had been first aroused by the rich cargoes of captured galleons laden with gold and spices, silks, porcelain, and drugs, obtained a footing at Surat on the peninsula of Hindustan.

The treaty concluded in 1654, between Portugal and Holland, left the former only Goa, Diu, Meliapore, and a few minor factories on the coasts of India, Macao in China, and half the island of Timor in the Indian Archipelago, while Brazil, ransomed for a sum of eight million francs, remained an appanage of the Crown of Braganza until 1822. The portentous growth of the Anglo-Indian empire crushed out whatever vitality might have been left in the Portuguese settlements, and they continued to exist only as insignificant enclaves in the wide domain of the paramount power. Bombay was ceded to England in 1661 as the dower of the Infanta Catherine on her marriage with Charles II., and, by a treaty concluded in 1703, Portugal accepted a position of subordination to England in matters of commerce and navigation.

Meantime the decline of Goa had been rapid and continuous. Maratha raiders and Dutch privateers were among the items of her misfortunes, and to these were added the partial silting up of her port and frequent visitations of cholera and fever due to the growing unhealthiness of the site. But, above and beyond all, her decay was due to internal corruption in a society founded originally on fraud, and steeped in the lees of its own excesses. So abrupt was the change in a few years that M. Tavernier, the French traveller, who described the Goanese ladies, during his first visit, in 1641, as living with the pomp of Eastern sultanas, found them at his second—in 1648—reduced to solicit alms, though he takes care to note that their pride evaded the humiliation of personal solicitation, by sending their pages to beg, while they remained in their litters. The decrease in the population was correspondingly rapid, and the figure of 225,000, reached in the early half of the seventeenth century, had, ere its close (1695), fallen to 20,000.

In 1759, after many tergiversations, the Government finally decided on the abandonment of the old capital, and the trans-

ference of the city to Panjim, now called New Goa, six miles lower down the river. The expulsion of the Jesuits at the same date completed the ruin of Old Goa, which in 1775 had but 1,600 inhabitants left. The suppression of the other religious orders in 1835 had equally unhappy results, and the abandoned churches and monasteries add to the desolation of the scene. Old Goa, once the Queen of the East, is now as completely ruined as Tadmor or Thebes, and shapeless masses of masonry buried in cocoa-nut groves mark the sites of palaces and warehouses. Some of the churches alone are still in preservation, and the cathedral bells, chiming the hours of prayer through the surrounding jungle, are an emblem of the religious associations that have survived the obliteration of all its worldly splendours.

New Goa has indeed inherited little else from the past. A drowsy town of some 16,000 inhabitants, its commerce, despite its fine harbour, is on a minute scale, and its annual revenue, which, to its credit be it said, a little more than balances its expenditure, is but £108,148. The island on which it stands has an area of 48 square miles, and a double frontage of navigable water. Its native name, Tisvadi, meaning thirty village communes, is still almost statistically accurate, as the number of these municipal units only exceeds that figure by one. No satisfactory etymology has been discovered for the name Goa itself, but that of Panjim is derived from *panji*, arable land above the reach of floods. The inlet, bounded north and south by the promontories of Bardez and Salsette, is divided into two anchorages, Agoado and Mormugão, by the Cabo or point of the island projecting between them. The land is low, but a continuous fringe of palm-forest relieves its shores, while the rugged outlines of the Western Ghats give them a picturesque background of mountain horizon. The town seen from the water has the charm which white buildings, mirrored in blue water, and smothered in tropical foliage, must always possess. The climate is relaxing, and the average rainfall during the triennial period ending in 1875 was 100·22 inches.

The territory of Goa, measuring about sixty miles by thirty, has an area of 1,062 square miles, of which 234,754 acres are under cultivation; and its population of 392,234, is divided into 232,089 Catholics, 128,824 Hindoos, and 2,775 Mussulmans. The little State is diversified with mountains, of which one peak, the Sonsagor, attains the height of 3,827 feet; and traversed by several dwarf rivers rising in the Ghats, the two longest being the Zuari and Mandavi, with courses of 39 and 38½ miles respectively. The division into the Velhas and Novas Conquistas (Old and New Conquests) implies different dates of annexation,

and a trifling distinction in rural organization. The village communes in the Velhas Conquistas, numbering 137, are so many organic centres, holding land in common and dividing the produce between their members after paying taxes and charges; while in the 257 villages of the Novas Conquistas, the vangor, or clan, is the collective unit, exercising the functions of proprietorship and distribution.

Rice is the staple produce, and is cultivated under two heads, the summer crop, called sorodio, sown in May or June, on ground watered by the monsoon, to be harvested in September; and the winter crop, vangana, dependent on artificial irrigation, sown in November and gathered in February. The increase varies from six to tenfold, according to locality, and the cost of culture is from one-third to one-half the value of the crop. In the rainy season of 1876, the total production was 443,171 khandis (a measure of 266 lb.), but the quantity grown only suffices for eight months, the remainder having to be supplied from abroad. Public granaries, called *celleiros*, have been organized as a safeguard against famine, the ever-haunting spectre of Eastern governments. The selling price of rice in 1874-5 was less than 1*d.* per lb., 2*s.* for 26 lb. being the actual rate.

Next in importance among rural industries is the cultivation of the cocoa-nut (*cocos nucifera*), grown generally on level ground and along the seashore. The Jesuits devoted much attention to its culture, and produced a valuable treatise on the subject called "*Arte Palmarica*." Cocoa-nuts form the principal export of Goa; and other tropical fruits and spices, areca nuts, mangoes, water melons, cinnamon, and pepper come next in order of precedence, the remainder consisting of salt-fish, gum, firewood, and salt. The principal imports, in addition to rice, are sugar, wines, tobacco, cloth, glass, and hardware.

Prices are very low, as a good cow may be bought for a pound and a pair of buffaloes for five, a pig for sixteen shillings, and a fowl for sixpence. The wages of artisans are 1*s.*, of labouring men 6*d.*, and of women 2½*d.* a day. A man-servant is paid 4*s.* a month, but maids receive only their food, with a periodical suit of clothes, and a present of ornaments on their marriage. Palanquins, termed *macas*, *catres*, or *cadeirinhas*, carried by four *boyas* or bearers, are the chief vehicles, horse carriages being unknown.

The political divisions of the Portuguese possessions in the East consist of the Province of Goa, and districts of *Damão* and *Diu*, ruled by a governor-general with a Junta or Council; and of *Macao*, *Timor*, and *Camboing*, under a governor. The Portuguese colonies are so far assimilated to the mother country,

that they send deputies to the Cortes, and, while defraying all their own expenses, contribute a quota to the naval budget of Portugal. The general direction of their affairs is confided to the Junta Consultiva do Ultramar, sitting in Lisbon.

The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Crown of Portugal in the East Indies, maintained unimpaired down to a very recent date, was the last survival of its former imperial sway. Deriving its original title of possession from the award of the Holy See, the condition annexed of religious propaganda was faithfully carried out. The first missionaries, chaplains in Albuquerque's fleet, were Dominican friars, established in Goa in 1510, and these were followed seven years later by Franciscans, who proved very active and successful preachers. Within the first eight years of their arrival, they held a like number of public baptisms, in which 7,000 natives were admitted into the church, and they made many converts throughout Southern India and the adjacent Archipelago. Goa, created on November 3, 1534, an Episcopal See, with jurisdiction from the Cape of Good Hope to China, but still suffragan to that of Funchal, received from the Franciscan Order its first bishop, Fr. João de Albuquerque, a man of great piety and learning. Under his auspices many of the native princes had embraced Christianity, even before the ten years' preaching of St. Francis, 1542-52, had given the great impetus to native conversions. Such increased extension of its authority entitled the See of Goa to be raised to archiepiscopal rank, conferred on it on February 4, 1557, and its Metropolitan in 1606 assumed the title of Primate of the East, while the King of Portugal holds that of Patron of the Catholic Missions of the East.

The Inquisition, the stern remedy for grave evils, its methods those of the age in which it flourished, was early established in Goa, and soon exercised a power co-ordinate with that of the Church and State. Only the Viceroy and Archbishop of Goa were exempt from the jurisdiction of the Grand Inquisitor, and even they had no power to withdraw others from it. Remote as it was from the centre of ecclesiastical authority, the Holy Office of Goa sometimes ventured to defy that of the Holy See itself, and a signal instance of such an abuse of power occurred in the middle of the seventeenth century.

Father Ephraim, of Auxerre, a Capuchin friar of great virtue and eminence, was the victim of the persecution, of which national jealousy on the part of the Portuguese at the establishment of his convent at Madrespatan, under shelter of the English guns at Fort St. George, is believed to have been the motive. Having repaired to the neighbouring Portuguese fort of San Thomé, as mediator in a dispute between the authorities of this

post and those of the British settlement, he was seized by the Portuguese Commandant, put in irons, and carried by sea to Goa, where he was imprisoned in the Palace of the Inquisition. This high-handed proceeding created great excitement throughout the Carnatic, and the mode of redress first sought was characteristic of the time and place. It was no less than the kidnapping of the Governor of San Thomé, whose very piety was made a means of ensnaring him. At the instigation of Father Zeno, another Capuchin monk, the Irish commandant of Fort St. George sent a party of soldiers to lie in wait for the Portuguese governor on his way to a little mountain shrine which he was in the habit of visiting every Saturday. The plot was successful, he was captured and lodged in the Capuchin Convent of Madrespatan (now Madras), only half a league distant, and there held as a hostage for the Superior. With the connivance of his guards, however, he found means to escape at the end of two days, and, making his way to his own territory, was received with great jubilation at San Thomé.

But the captivity of Father Ephraim, who had influential connections, his brother being M. de Château des Bois, Counsellor of the Parliament of Paris, could not fail to make a stir in Europe; the King of Portugal, as well as the Pope, was appealed to, and the latter actually threatened to excommunicate *en masse* the whole clergy of Goa if the prisoner were not released. What neither royal nor papal mandate could bring to pass was successfully effected by the intervention of a Mohammedan prince. The King of Golconda, a zealous friend of the imprisoned Father, having then an army on foot engaged in fighting the Rajah of the Carnatic, ordered his troops to besiege San Thomé and ravage the Portuguese settlements if the Inquisition did not surrender its prey before the expiration of two months. Father Ephraim was accordingly released, but only consented to quit his prison when the clergy of Goa went to escort him thence in public procession.

He had suffered from fifteen to twenty months' incarceration, during which he was not allowed even his breviary, and only by stratagem secured materials for writing to solace his weary hours. A pencil secreted under his arm-pit escaped the search of the familiars of the Holy Office, and the wrappings of the cigars perpetually smoked by his companion, a Maltese reprobate, supplied the paper for his manuscript. This occurrence was still recent in 1648, when M. Tavernier,* on his visit to Goa, saw and spoke with Father Ephraim, and heard from him all details

* "Les Six Voyages de Jean Baptiste Tavernier, Chevalier Baron d'Aubonne, en Turquie, en Perse et aux Indes." Paris, 1682.

of his captivity. One singular result, according to the traveller, was produced by it—the cure of the prisoner's squint, from the constant concentration of his sight in a particular direction, in writing by the light of a very small window.

The cruelties practised on prisoners of the Inquisition have been, however, much exaggerated, and Senhor da Fonseca thus describes their régime, at page 217 of his valuable work :—

As regards the treatment generally given to the prisoners in this palace, it appears that the rigour of the Inquisition was not carried to such a frightful extent as is generally believed. In fact, the prisoners were, in point of food and clothing, far better off than those in the civil jails. Each prisoner was confined in a separate cell, and was provided with a bedstead and a mattress, and, if he were a European, with a quilt. All prisoners were served daily with three meals; breakfast at six o'clock A.M., consisting of rice gruel for natives, and a three-ounce loaf, fried fish, fruits and sometimes sausages for the Europeans; dinner at ten A.M., and supper at four P.M., consisting of rice and fish. The Europeans were better provided for, as they had bread and meat twice a week for dinner, and bread, fried fish, rice and fish or egg curry almost daily for supper.

Guards were stationed in the corridors, and strict silence maintained under penalty of whipping, but no torture was applied to the prisoners, either in the cells, or when under examination. The sick received every care and attendance, but were denied all religious ministrations save those of a confessor when in actual danger of death. The dread solemnity of the auto-da-fé, when the prisoners were delivered over to the secular arm to undergo their various sentences, took place every two or three years, and the fullest details of its lugubrious pageantry, as well as all other particulars on this subject, are found in the narrative of Dellon.*

The jurisdiction of the Crown of Portugal was confirmed and extended by the Concordat of 1857, by which all British India was placed under the royal patronage, and the Holy See was precluded from exercising any act of authority save with the consent of the Portuguese Government. Several attempts having been made to induce the latter to abandon its claims, the Supreme Pontiff published the brief, *Studio et Vigilantia*, by which seven vicariates were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of Goa. In the negotiations which followed, lasting through the whole of 1885, the Pope desired to leave only the actual Portuguese territory under the Royal patronage, while Portugal, on her side, claimed the re-establishment of the historical dioceses of Cranganor, Cochin, Meliapore, and Malacca. A compromise was at last

* "Relation de l'Inquisition de Goa." Amsterdam, 1719.

arrived at, and a new Concordat negotiated, by which the archdioceses of Goa and Cranganor, with the suffragan dioceses of Cochin and Meliapore, remain under the patronage of Portugal, the Goanese churches of Malacca and Singapore being attached to the Portuguese diocese of Macao, while the Holy See regains its freedom of action throughout the greater part of British India.

The conclusion of the Concordat was immediately followed by the publication of the apostolic letters *Humanae Salutis Auctor*, under date of September 1, 1886, constituting the Catholic hierarchy of Hindustan. The archbishopric of Goa is hereby erected into a metropolitan See, and its titular raised to the dignity of Patriarch of the East Indies, with the suffragan sees of Cranganor, Cochin, and Meliapore submitted to his authority. All the other apostolic vicariates of Hindustan, with the island of Ceylon, and the Prefecture of Central Bengal, are erected into dioceses, and seven have the rank of archbishoprics—namely, Agra, Bombay, Verapoly, Calcutta, Madras, Pondicherry, and Colombo. The missions of the Punjab, Agra, Patna, Central Bengal, Vizagapatam, Mysore, Kandy, Sinde, Poona, Mangalore, Verapoly, Colombo, Jaffna, Coimbatore, Pondicherry, Madras, and Hyderabad are freed from the yoke of a double jurisdiction, which still exists only in those of Madura and Bombay. It is furthermore laid down that the archbishops and bishops of India shall communicate with the Propaganda, while the Patriarch of Goa and his suffragans shall address themselves to the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs.*

Thus vanishes the last imperial prerogative of that dazzling conquest by which the little kingdom of the Tagus, the terror of Asia and the envy of Europe, realized the golden dream of ages, and entered into possession of the glowing wonder-world of the elder universe. The prize of that epoch of romance, when nature, not yet ransacked of all her treasures, had still secrets wherewith to reward adventure, and the bold mariner, sailing into unknown seas, might chance upon new heavens and a new earth, it had a glamour which still clings to its faded memory, and invests the deserted streets of the once Golden Goa with such a visionary halo, as must ever cling to the wreck of Empire.

E. M. CLERKE.

* *Catholic Missions*, November, 1886, p. 106.

ART. VII.—THE INFLUENCE OF FATALISM ON
OPINION.*

1. *The Signs of the Times*. By THOMAS CARLYLE. 1829.
2. *On Democracy*: an Address read before the Midland Institute, Oct. 6, 1884. By JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.
3. *Manifesto to the Electors of Midlothian*. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. Oct. 1885.
4. *On the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion*. By Sir GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Bart.
5. *On Compromise*. By JOHN MORLEY. London: Macmillan. 1886.
6. *History of an Idea*. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. 1886.

MORE than fifty years ago Carlyle ventured to denounce what he called "The Mechanism of the Age," in an essay† marked with all the picturesque vigour and richness of his style. He bewailed the tendency which substituted or threatened to substitute the press, magazines, cyclopædias and hand-books for permanent literary achievements, subjected the free aspirations of art to Academies and Societies, and made politicians grope for an ideal in constitutions and institutions rather than a statesmanship based on principle. The "mechanism," he declared, which had subdued external nature, was trespassing beyond its proper sphere. It had usurped the domain of life, thought, and morality, and was then sapping the springs of originality and freedom. Hence the endeavour to explain virtue away, reducing it ultimately to fear of pain or hope of pleasure, and to make duty to one's neighbour merely equivalent to a self-regarding benevolence.

The new wonders wrought by physical science had produced a misleading enthusiasm for reducing everything to a system, which, he argued, would not only bar a real material progress, but would finally tend to oust a belief in the invisible. "We are giants," he says, "in physical power, in a deeper than metaphorical sense, we are Titans, that strive by heaping mountain on mountain to conquer Heaven also."

Carlyle was writing here in the familiar rôle of a prophet, pointing to probable rather than to ascertained results; but with all his prophetic qualities he would hardly have foreseen the

* A Paper read at a meeting of the Academia on November 23, 1886.

† "The Signs of the Times," published in 1829.

immense development in our own day of the tendency to which he points. Mechanism has grown into Fatalism, a Fatalism so universally productive of mental torpor, that when, for instance, the Duke of Argyll denounces the present "Reign of Flabbiness," or Mr. Goschen pleads for the recovery of the almost lost art of original independent thinking, they meet in the main with little encouragement except the pity extended to the misplaced energies of eccentric genius. To find a person, when the question is a political one, with clear personal convictions, based on something more rational than universal hearsay, or "the tide of public opinion," has almost become an event of importance. Some public man, of sufficient standing to secure a column in the daily paper, lights on a plausible phrase or two, scatters them in his next speech like plums in a pudding; the leader next morning pets him with unthinking praise, the local association or league, parrot-like, adopts the cry, and then the thing is done. Those whom Mr. John Morley describes as "the great army of the indolent good, the people who lead excellent lives and never use their reason,"* follow suit, and exert themselves only in denouncing men who hold back and claim a little time to think, as laggards or mutineers or secessionists. If one of the supposed laggards shows a *prima facie* reasonableness in his demand for breathing space, it is urged that after all it is useless to oppose what in the end is inevitable, as though the very best way to make a thing inevitable were not to join in the chorus of declaration that so it is. Let me not be understood, however, as referring in these remarks to any one political party. This loss of grit and fibre, this tendency to drift, to bend to what is supposed to be irresistible, is, as I hope to show, a common feature in the formation of political opinion of every shade and leaning.

As one of the symptoms of the disease to which I wish to direct attention, let me dwell on the fact, perhaps sufficiently obvious, that Parliament has largely ceased to be a deliberative body. Not that there is any lack of oratory, not that speeches are shorter, or members more content than of yore to give a silent vote; the new process of winnowing measures through Grand Committees, the threatened proposals as to *clôture* by bare majority, tell quite another tale. What I mean is the admitted dislike in the House to appeals to principle or anything savouring of what is unhappily called dry reasoning. Were Burke living now, it is probable that even for enlightened legislators in a Reformed Parliament his rising would be as sure a signal for dispersion as in the days when the Speech on Conciliation with the Colonies failed to prevent even a Sheridan from slinking out of the House behind the back benches. And

* "Burke" ("English Men of Letters"), p. 153.

so, if Mr. Leonard Courtney wishes to unburden his soul he flies to the remote parts of Cornwall; and, sad to say, his high speculations only make him appear in the eyes of many an abnormal specimen of the legislator. Not long ago Mr. Goschen, in an address at the Eighty Club, endeavoured to probe out and formulate the principles of the legislation of the last decade, whereupon critics in the press said Mr. Goschen was a theorist, a term, strange to say, meant to imply condemnation and importing unfitness for the task of government. There are, it is true, congresses and conferences without number on the many heterogeneous subjects that come under what is called "Social Science;" but confining our view to political questions, there is little doubt that public meetings of the usual kind are to a very slight degree deliberative; they are in the main not gatherings of persons desirous of hearing the *pros* and *cons.*, and of inquiring what is right and just, but are composed of individuals whose minds are made up on the subject at issue, and who are merely anxious to swell the chorus of approval or disapproval. The primary object of assemblages of this character is not to create or test opinions, but to ratify and publish them with some parade and solemnity. In Parliament, as out of it, it has almost become a maxim that speeches do not gain votes, or alter judgments; and it is no paradox to say that the success of an orator is measured rather by the power of flattering the prepossessions of his friends than by his success in shaking the convictions of his opponents.

The new doctrine of Fatalism, let me say at once, does not at all imply that men think and act without motives of any kind. Beliefs that are arrived at under the new canon have their own sanction, but that sanction is no longer the internal sense of reasonableness or justice, but the pressure of a tendency which is given a name, and then somehow invested with an external existence. Individual judgment is surrendered to what is styled the course of "Public Opinion," not because it is considered that error is more likely to be winnowed out and the truth to come to light when the majority agree (which would be quite reasonable); but because "the force of circumstances," or "the spirit of the age," or as learned persons say the "*Zeitgeist*," is conceived as a force with life and momentum, carrying the helpless age onwards in its steady, irresistible march. To attempt to stop its course by audaciously asserting what right reason commends, would be as useless (if we are interpreting a common fallacy rightly) as to endeavour to stop a steam engine in motion by patting it on the boiler. The common sense of most does indeed keep a fretful realm in awe in a manner the poet perhaps never conceived. As Carlyle says in the essay already referred to, "By arguing on the

force of circumstances we have argued away all force from ourselves, and stand leashed together, uniform in dress and movement, like the slaves of some boundless galley. . . . Practically considered our creed is fatalism, and, free in hand and foot, we are shackled in heart and soul in far worse than Feudal chains."

Nor is it merely that this Necessitarian mood corrupts the every-day judgment of ordinary folk who claim no intellectual supereminence; the poison has spread much further, and stains the deliberate pronouncements of men who rank, and justly rank, amongst our teachers and leaders. Mr. Russell Lowell, for instance, has the name of being an independent thinker, if ever there was one, yet he too has not escaped infection, but has deliberately adopted what I may call the inclined-plane theory. For instance in his address (otherwise admirably conceived in aim and tone) to the Midland Institute * on the extension of the political power of the masses, these are his words:—

"What we used to call the tendency or drift, what we are being taught more wisely to call the evolution of things, has for some time been setting in this direction. . . . There is no use arguing with the inevitable. The only argument available with an east wind is to put on your overcoat. And in this case, also, the prudent will prepare themselves to encounter what they cannot prevent. Some people advise us to put on the brakes, as if the movement of which we are conscious were that of a railway train running down an incline. But a metaphor is no argument, though it be sometimes the gunpowder to drive it home and imbed it in the memory."

And again:—

"The question for us, as it has been for all before us, is to make the transition gradual and easy; to see that our points are right, so that the train may not come to grief."†

A metaphor is indeed no argument, to requote Mr. Lowell's own words, but unhappily it is often an intellectual *ignis fatuus* for the most wary. Mr Lowell himself, usually the most lucid of thinkers, has in his own neatly chiselled phrases given us an example of the fallacy against which he would warn us. Why speak as he does of "evolution," "setting in this direction," of the "inevitable," and of looking to our "points." Fatalism is fatalism, though it is rechristened with the scientific name of "evolution."‡

* On "Democracy:" see *Times*, Oct. 7, 1884.

† Mr. Lowell has recently spoken in a vein more worthy of himself at the tercentenary of Harvard College. "Democracy," he says, "must show its capacity for producing, not a higher average man, but the highest possible type of manhood in all its manifold varieties, or it is a failure."

‡ Dr. Whewell makes some pertinent observations on the danger of loosely applying scientific terms when their strict meaning is forgotten:—"The language of science, when thus resembling common language, is liable to be employed with an absence of scientific precision, which alone

Democracy is irresistible and inevitable only because a number of apathetic people assume that it is, certainly not from any law of nature. Sir Henry Maine has recently shown that if history teaches anything it teaches the opposite doctrine, a doctrine accepted almost universally amongst political writers, and justified by facts until the constitution of the United States formed the one grand exception in giving evidence of stability.

It may be interesting to give some additional examples of the modern heresy, from the writings of those who pass for keen observers of the signs of the times, and play a prominent part in public life. Mr. Labouchere, for instance, has been extolled by Mr. Matthew Arnold for possessing the rare un-British virtue of "lucidity," so we cannot do better than quote him. This is Mr. Labouchere's pæan of triumph on the recent extension of the franchise :—

"The flood is rising, and will carry all before it. The checks and counterpoises which make property more powerful than numbers have been removed. The statesman who does not recognize that it will be vain to resist the current with old saws is lost to practical wisdom. New wine will burst old bottles. . . . All that he can hope is to direct the stream. . . . Old Mother Partingtons will find it impossible to stem the incoming ocean with their mops. The days of checks and counterpoises are over, our triumph—a triumph complete and absolute—is not far distant."*

Even Mr. John Morley, whose faculty of gorgeous literary presentation and searching logic have done yeoman's service in exploding a very similar fallacy, has breathed the air of contagion, as the following passage bears witness :—

"Great economic and social forces flow with a tidal sweep over communities that are only half conscious of what is befalling them. Wise statesmen are those who foresee what time is bringing, and endeavour to shape institutions and to mould men's thoughts and purpose in accordance with the change that is silently surrounding them."†

I pass from the critic and theorist to a statesman of the shrewd, practical type, the Earl of Derby. In a speech made at Blackburn last autumn, this titled embodiment of British common-sense, touching upon a then keenly discussed question, reaches

gives it any value. Popular writers and talkers, when they speak of *force*, *momentum*, *action*, and *reaction*, and the like, often afford examples of the inaccuracy arising from the scientific appropriation of common terms."
—*Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*, vol. i. p. 52.

* *Fortnightly Review*, No. 226, October, 1885.

† "Life of Cobden," vol. ii. p. 484.

the following high level of exhortation: "Disestablishment, and at least partial disendowment, in my mind, must ultimately come; and if I were a parson, or one of those laymen who identify themselves especially with ecclesiastical interests and ideas, I should rather look to making the best terms possible than to resist what is inevitable."

Of the proper and legitimate sphere of compromise, which Lord Derby here curtly describes as "making terms" with the "inevitable" we hope to say a few words later on; for the present it is enough to make some little attempt in searching out and laying bare the poison. For the evil of the new way of thinking is that its characteristic fallacies are shrouded up in clouds of verbiage, or escape notice in the distracting glamour of a rhetorical setting. A logical analysis would at once show the folly of this talk about "tendencies" and "currents" and "streams;" but logic is not in fashion just now, and besides there is so little time for it.

We will place before our readers only two more specimens of political utterances, and leave him to judge of their taste and virtue. The first is an extract from the Midlothian Manifesto of Mr. Gladstone, in the autumn of 1885; "a few words," as he describes them, "to qualify oversanguine expectations," and to "mitigate alarms," which appeared to him exaggerated, though they are entertained by many whom, &c. &c.

"With respect to the severance of the Church of England from the State [he goes on], I think it obvious that so vast a question cannot become practical until it shall have grown familiar to the public mind by thorough discussion, with the further condition that the proposal, when thoroughly discussed, shall be approved. Neither, I think, can such a change arise, in a country such as ours, except with a large observance of the principles of equity and liberality, as well as with the general consent of the nation. *We can hardly, however, be surprised if those who observe that a current almost throughout the civilized world slowly sets in this direction should desire or fear that among ourselves too it may be found to operate.* I cannot forecast the dim and distant courses of the future."

Observe there is not a word of the policy or justice of a measure of Disestablishment. Not a gleam of light thrown upon the perplexities of the Disendowment question; no recommendation, no advice from the lips of one whose very entrance into public life was marked by a two-volumed deliverance on the relations of Church and State; who is known as a devoted Churchman and the first of financiers. We are asked merely to observe a current, which in unmetaphorical language simply means that a certain number of people (whether reasonably or otherwise, we are not told), join in thinking or saying that Disestablishment must or

will come about. Whether they are probably right or wrong in their statement is absolutely irrelevant to the question whether the end would in itself be desirable. The credibility of the prophecy I leave out of sight for the moment, though one would expect something to be said on this point. The view against which I desire to lodge a first protest is that a rational man, with powers of will and action left in him, should passively subject himself to the "operation" of a "current," without knowing or inquiring whether it is "slowly setting" towards a dangerous reef or a placid haven.

Mr. Chamberlain does not indulge much in metaphors, but his plain language has been often dangerously near propounding doctrines which, in the writer's humble opinion, completely misapprehend the duty of a man of light and leading under the democratic *régime*, and would be fatal, if carried out, to intellectual independence. Let us take, for instance, an extract from a speech at Inverness : *

"I should like, however, to warn you not to rest on the opinions or good-will of any individual. The Government, and still less a single member of any Government, cannot go one inch further than the average opinion of the party and of the country. Power is now in your hands, and it is you, and not we who are responsible for future legislation."

Surely this is an unworthy view of the duty of a statesman. Leaving out of sight the effacement of Ministerial responsibility which the doctrine involves, it almost comes to this, that those whose gifts and powers make them the natural leaders of men, who are equipped with all the advantages of education, leisure and opportunity, are not to possess their own souls, but to be ready to think, speak and act, in accordance with what is reckoned the masterful and irresistible tide of "average opinion." Needless to say what is best and most useful is not to be discovered by any system of averages, or any other short rule of thumb. At any rate, it is certain the ship of state will fare badly if the men of brains and counsel are to approach political problems as an unknown sea, and allow their vessel, *nudum remigio latus*, to drift on a chance course dictated by the average opinion of the ship's company.†

* September 17, 1885.

† John Stuart Mill will hardly be called an enemy to democratic government, but his conception of the duty of a statesman was something very different. "The public, collectively, is abundantly ready to impose, not only its general narrow views of its interests, but its abstract opinions, and even its tastes, as laws binding on individuals, and our present civilization tends so strongly to make the power of persons acting in masses the only substantial power in society, that there never was more necessity

A slightly different complexion is given to the fatalistic mode of forming opinions according as the bent of mind is optimistic or the reverse. I include, generally, under the term optimists those who, admitting and bewailing the evil and unhappiness of to-day, look forward with strong and assured confidence to the gradual disappearance of the bad, and the triumph of the good. In this sense, *per contra*, a pessimist may be one who takes a roseate view of the present life about him, but he looks at the future, and, above all, at a future of change, as involving necessarily a growth of evil and misery. But, however much men of these opposite classes may differ in their secret emotions, it is strange how, if once the fashionable fatalistic spirit comes upon them, they will be found, in the political sphere at least, saying and doing the same thing.

The pessimist will generally call himself a Tory, and admit upon a little questioning he is a Tory Democrat; the optimist, on the other hand, will naturally be a Radical. Tory Democracy is little else after all than the old Toryism recognising the inevitableness of the coming change, and becoming keenly alive to the advisability of Conservatives in office being the passive instruments of fate, rather than Liberals. To watch how the wind blows is the grand maxim of the new school, which allows itself to be urged on to the hazardous makeshift of dishing Whigs, not certainly from a natural love of the work, but from a sense of the helplessness of striving against what the Fates have decreed. The optimistic fatalist, on the other hand, will generally style himself a Radical, whether he still adhere to the *laissez-faire* of the older Liberalism, or cling to that belief in the efficacy of state-aid and the omnipotence of Government for good, which is the characteristic of the modern school. He will rarely discuss any political problem without the phrases "path of progress," or "march of civilization," coming to his lips; and it would be difficult to find a limit to the extent to which he believes human conditions capable of improvement. Zealots of this class may differ as to the respective merits of their contrivances and panaceas, but they will generally look back on the past with less reverence than piety, and agree that, with the unfettered sway of knowledge in these latter days, happiness and virtue are to advance with leaps and bounds:

for surrounding individual independence of thought, speech, and conduct with the most powerful defences, in order to maintain that originality of mind, and individuality of character which are the only source of real progress, and of most of the qualities which make the human race much superior to any herd of animals."—*Political Economy*, vol. i. p. 508, and cf. vol. i. p. 248.

Forward, forward, let us range!

Let the great world spin for ever down the ringing grooves of change.
Through the shadow of the globe we sweep into the younger day,
Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay.

The School of History, of which Buckle and Macaulay were the most eminent exponents, is largely tinged with fatalism of this type. Buckle especially rejoices in the death of the "protective spirit" which held minds in durance in the ancient days, "the State teaching men what they are to do, the Church teaching them what they are to believe." With the removal of this incubus of superstition, civilization advances with sure and unfaltering strides; and so, he argues, the darkness of the middle ages is as impossible to recur as the twelfth century, for the causes of that darkness have been removed. The business of the historian in Buckle's view is to show that "the movements of nations are perfectly regular, and that, like all other movements, they are solely determined by their antecedents." The historian must be "imbued with the spirit of science, which teaches as an article of faith the doctrine of uniform sequence; in other words the doctrine that, certain events having already happened, certain other events corresponding to them will also happen."*

What occurred at a recent political crisis illustrates to some extent the influence of a supposed overruling destiny on the minds of practical politicians.

There were few Tories who in 1885 approved of the extension of the borough franchise to the counties on the bare merits of the proposal. But the great majority had little doubt in their hearts that what was called the natural expansion of the Act of 1867 was fated to come about in the near future. And so the sword was sheathed, and the opposition to the measure, vigorous at first, became half-hearted, and in the end was sullenly withdrawn (with an extenuating plea), from a feeling that, to use Mr. Lowell's phrase, there is no use arguing with the inevitable. This was the opiate that served to quiet the stormy sadness of the righteous Tory soul.

To take another question, perhaps it is no paradox to say that one of the main reasons why the subject of the disestablishment of the English Church is not now pushed to the front with any great prominence, and its advocates are apparently less vigorous and uncompromising than in the pristine days of Miall, is due to a prevailing belief, shadowy, yet unequivocal in its main features, that a great upheaval is somehow imminent in the near future, and that the finger of fate points unerringly to the downfall of the Establishment.

* "History of Civilization," vol. ii. p. 325.

Many other instances of the formation of opinion by the process of drifting and substituting a supposed tendency for the old standard of the wise and the just present themselves in recent political events. However wise may be the laws which the Legislature has passed in recent years (and with this I have nothing to do), the methods by which its assent has been attained have not always been so admirable. Whatever view may be taken, for instance, of recent legislation on the tenure of Irish land, on the subject of the Scottish crofters, or on the *status* and powers of married women, it is unquestionable that on these points views have been developed and positions reached by processes far other than dry argumentation. Debate and discussion in and out of the House show over and over again, how, when abstract reasoning had failed, the scale would be turned in favour of a particular clause by an appeal to the tide of opinion, the force of circumstances, or the tendency of the hour. In this sort of way the Irish Land Act of 1881 was treated as a mere natural development of the Act of 1870, and the doctrine of the Three F's discovered to be a necessary growth from the germs of the legislation of the previous decade, as though the very essence of a principle were not in such a case the limits of its application. And so in the end the error may assume a more subtle and misleading form, when a measure to which assent has been given, from considerations of this kind, is at a later period treated as solemnly approved of from its own innate justice, and so becomes a new starting-point for fresh developments.

The fatalism which thus operates in forming and shaping opinion is quite distinct from that sense of purpose and order governing the apparent chaos of the world, the belief in a reign of inflexible law, which in one shape or other has been found in the great races of mankind, a temper of mind common to the stubborn Roman soldiery, the fanatical hordes of Mahomet, and the evangelical Cromwellian trooper. But this was a fatalism that spent its force in the sphere of action, and had little share in moulding or guiding mental assents. The Greek did not allow his belief in *ἀνάγκη* to interfere with a logical conclusion. Such a Necessitarian creed has been found consistent with self-reliance, originality of thought, and obstinacy of belief in the highest degree. Indeed, for examples of this we need not go back to classic days, when in our own age we have witnessed the career of a Napoleon and a Gordon.

It may be that modern speculations indefinitely extending the reign of law, hypotheses purporting to include in their wide embrace all things knowable and unknowable, and bringing into prominence a purely mechanical theory of the universe, have exercised an influence beyond their proper sphere. Politicians

endeavour to give a scientific tinge to their utterances by mis-using a scientific nomenclature. The application of such terms as "evolution" and "development" to political problems perhaps accounts to some extent for the supremacy of the Necessitarian jargon which now passes from lip to lip with easy iteration. One realizes, in the face of these facts, what it was made Carlyle so fierce in his crusade against all forms of *cant*. "Ach Gott!" we may say with him, "it is frightful to live amongst echoes."

There can be little doubt that the modern system of democratic government has done much to make what is called "average opinion" appear omnipotent and irresistible, and to reduce the art of politics to discovering and registering what the decrees of the majority may be. The will of the majority is the law; its expressed opinions are carried into practice with rigid and swift precision, and there is a strong tendency to invest with a concrete existence that which is so universally potent. It is forgotten that "Majority" is a name and nothing more, though spelt with a big "m;" that every minority is a majority *in posse*; that, strictly speaking, the phrase, "average opinion," "public opinion" import a contradiction in terms. Thought, judgment, assent, are operations proper to individual minds; and there does not exist anywhere such a thing as "public opinion" any more than men can have a common soul. The opinions *quâ* opinions of a number of men are worth very little more, except under certain special conditions, than the separate opinions of anyone forming the mass. Government by a majority is, after all, based on far other considerations than that the concurrence of many minds necessarily strengthens a conclusion.* It would be puerile to insist on the truth, were it not so often forgotten in practice, that the value of an opinion is to be measured only by the grounds on which it is adopted, and not by the number of people who hold it. Chances of error are not eliminated by multiplying instances, unless in such cases as when there is a common avouchment that a certain truth is primary and intuitive, or when witnesses to a fact agree, or when there is independent investigation.

It is perhaps not too much to be wondered at that under the existing conditions of majority rule its proper function of carrying opinions into practice should be exceeded; that in many cases it should suppress individual reasoning, and induce a blind acquiescence from a *sensè* of the hopelessness and

* For a clear and full investigation of the limits of the application of the rule of the majority, see Sir George Cornewall Lewis's "Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion," chapters vi. and vii.

inutility of holding opposite views. The decrees of the majority are only to be ascertained by periodical counting of millions of indistinguishable voting papers; the issues at stake are often mixed up in hopeless confusion, the why and wherefore, the hidden motives for decision are never to be revealed, and the onlooker only hears the shouting and sees the machinery of the ballot-box. However unreasonable, it is not so much to be wondered at, human nature being what it is, that a mystical existence is given to the author of these imperious decrees, and that many bow down before them with helpless awe as the behests of an irresistible destiny.

Many other reasons suggest themselves why undue regard is paid at the present day to the belief of others, especially when they form a majority. The field of knowledge is enormously extended, life is more complex, the legislature every year has imposed upon it new duties, whilst in the last resort government is in the hands of those who have least leisure for independent thinking. There is besides that natural dislike to remain in a state of doubt, not likely to be less common in an age when success in life depends so much on the power of "making up one's mind," and thus a wholesome prudence in suspending belief is apt by practical men to be treated as a mental failing. Then there is that dread of singularity so well expressed by the Greek *aídos*, that "sense of reverence and shame" for collective opinion which, as Professor Jebb has pointed out, is so abundantly illustrated as early as the Homeric Poems.*

Added to these causes the dislike of labour and a misplaced self-distrust combine to render what is called public opinion little more than mere assertion, the unthinking repetition of the sayings of the market place—that which Cardinal Newman places in the lowest rank of notional assents.† Even when the influence of conventionalism does not result in the positive adoption of current formulas, but produces only a mental lethargy preventing or checking speech or action, much harm is done; for nowadays opinions unexpressed by voice or vote are as worthless as blank cartridge in the battlefield. Perhaps they ought rather to be compared to damp ammunition, for they are even unequal

* See *Fortnightly Review*, vol. xxxvi. N.S. 570, "Ancient Organs of Public Opinion." Professor Jebb gives a number of curious instances of the influence of "average opinion" over Homeric heroes. The Greek indefinite pronoun "*tis*" represents the public feeling. "*Tis*" is the spokesman of popular sentiment, that at critical periods supplies the governing motive. Professor Jebb, I may add, has discovered from some vigorous Tory sentiments of a passage in the *Odyssey* that "*tis*" is the earliest authentic example of the Conservative working man!

† See "Grammar of Assent," pp. 43, 54, and 59, *et passim*.

to the poor service of making a noise and frightening the enemy.

One great mischief resulting from an undue conformity to average common sense is that many of the qualifications and limitations which almost all political problems present disappear in the process of reducing them to the simplicity necessary for an electorate including every grade of intelligence. But the result of thus sifting away the complexities of a question often is to eliminate the only points that merit discussion. The contest is now not so much about main principles as about the limits and methods of their application, and what is to be done when they cross or seem to cross each other. It is here that the loose oratory of the platform and the metaphors and similes that are now made to do duty for principles completely fail. As an instance of this take the way in which the question of minority representation was recently treated. It is unnecessary to speculate whether any of the proposals made were at once intelligible and effective; at least it is certain there was a clear case for full investigation, and that the question should not have been kicked out of the field of discussion in so summary a manner. But to observe how the present system of voting worked injustice needed something of a patient and involved examination of details and figures, and the champions of popular rights won an easy victory by uttering crude generalizations concerning the law of the majority, and attempts to check the people's will, as if the whole object of the inquiry were not precisely to ascertain that will.

Another baneful result of allowing high considerations of truth and justice to be blurred or effaced by the hard maxims of a Necessitarian creed, is that spirit of compromise, compromise of an illegitimate kind, which now so generally passes for the essence of political wisdom. Mr. John Morley has well shown* how this spurious doctrine of conformity, the modern *disciplina arcana*, grows out of that particular mental mood which is the special object of his attack, that habit of "putting social convenience in the first place, and respect for truth in the second," that "shrinking deference to the *status quo*, not merely as having a claim not to be lightly dealt with . . . but as being the last word, and final test of truth and justice." Compromise of this illegitimate kind, with the attendant evils so pithily and graphically described by Mr. John Morley, is not less the sure result of being possessed with the idea that "it is no use arguing with the inevitable." Lord Derby has frankly told us not to resist fate, but "to make the best possible terms with it;" excellent advice if destiny

* "On Compromise:" see chapters i., iii., and v. especially.

showed an accommodating spirit, and were not a phantom creation of the brain. Of course there may be overwhelming reasons why, with the very object of ultimately attaining the best and wisest end, the sentiments of the majority should be respected, and allowance made for the deep-rooted force of habit or prejudice, why in deference to received notions we should for a time give up all attempts to realize our opinions, or even abstain from expressing them. We may in this way give up a part to acquire a part, but not with an idea of abandoning the rest, nor otherwise than as making a step in advance towards our ultimate aim. That is one thing, it is quite another to allow a spirit of cowardice or shuddering conformity to keep our real opinions lodged silent within our hearts, or worse still, make our heart or voice give a flaccid assent to what we believe to be politically unjust or dishonourable.

Mr. John Morley has some apt words, scouting the notion that, because a subject is not ripe for a practical treatment (within the sphere of practical politics, let us say), "you and I are therefore entirely relieved from the duty of having clear ideas about it. . . . Take the political field: politicians and newspapers almost systematically refuse to talk about a new idea which is not capable of being at once embodied in a Bill, and receiving the royal assent before the following August. *There is something rather contemptible, seen from the ordinary standard of intellectual integrity, in the position of a Minister who waits to make up his mind whether a given measure, say the disestablishment of the Irish Church, is in itself, and on the merits, desirable, until the official who runs diligently up and down the backstairs of the party tells him that the measure is practicable and required in the interests of the land.* . . . The education of chiefs by followers, of followers by chiefs, into the abandonment in a month of the traditions of centuries, or the principles of a lifetime, may conduce to the rapid and easy working of the machine. It certainly marks a triumph of the political spirit which the author of "The Prince" might have admired. It is assuredly mortal to the habits of intellectual self-respect in the society which allows itself to be amused by the cajolery and legerdemain and self-sophistication of its rulers."*

It is instructive to compare Mr. Morley's fully considered views with those of Mr. Gladstone on the same question of political morality. Mr. Gladstone is meeting the argument advanced by Lord Hartington and others, that he had either

* "On Compromise," pp. 95, 97, 98. It is noticeable that this passage, written in 1874, remains unaltered in the new edition of 1886.

conceived the intention of Home Rule precipitately, or had concealed it unduly. This is the answer:—"In the first place, I deny that it is the duty of every Minister to make known even to his colleagues every idea which has formed itself in his mind. I should even say that the contradictory proposition would not be absurd. . . . But letting pass, for argument sake, a very irrational proposition, I grapple with the dilemma, and say *non sequitur*; the consequence asserted is no consequence at all. *It was no consequence from my not having condemned Home Rule that I had either not considered it or had adopted it. What is true is, that I had not publicly and in principle condemned it, and also that I had mentally considered it. But I had neither adopted nor rejected it, and for the very simple reason that it was not ripe either for adoption or rejection.*"*

We have italicized the parts of the two quotations which show most strikingly the fundamental disagreement between the chief and his lieutenant, concerning the duty of a democratic leader.

The fact is, and recent events in particular abundantly prove it, that public opinion has not at all that force and strength attributed to it by the current delusion of a political necessity. History shows how the most deeply seated popular prejudices have been successfully conquered by the wholesome fearless expression of independent opinion by the courage of those whom Matthew Arnold aptly calls the "Remnant." Man is still master of his fate, and the phantom enemy's armour when tested will be found to be only of the pasteboard kind. What individual courage and persistency can do in combating the convictions of a biassed majority can be seen in the successful crusade (by many deemed hopeless) in the first Midlothian campaign, and (to join great things with small) the victory of Mr. Bradlaugh on the oath question. Never was a time, perhaps, when earnestness and enthusiasm were more potent with the masses, and the acts and words of those who determinedly face unpopularity in defence of their own cherished beliefs meet with a more generous appreciation. But, for the most part, public men prefer swimming with the tide to stemming it, bending the knee to an idol in great part of their own manufacture. The error is contagious; the claptrap about necessity and "force of circumstances" passes from lip to lip and becomes the political stock-in-trade of a whole generation, and so we have the spectacle of majorities drifting with the tendency and the tide of a destiny which is nothing more than a name for the combined flabbiness and lethargy of individual minds.

N. J. SYNNOTT.

* "History of an Idea," p. 5.

ART. VIII.—THE STORY OF THE FRENCH EXILES.

Le Clergé français réfugié en Angleterre. Par F. X. PLASSE, Chanoine Titulaire de Clermont. Two vols. Paris : Victor Palmé. 1886.

A GREAT gap in both English and French history has been happily filled by the publication of these volumes by Canon Plasse. In 1802, the Abbé de Lubersac, Vicar General of Narbonne, printed in London, and dedicated to George III. his "*Journal historique et religieux de l'Emigration et Déportation du Clergé de France en Angleterre*," a book by which its author "wished to make known to all nations, and to the remotest posterity, the magnanimity of England's king and the generosity of his subjects." But his narrative, though conceived in a noble spirit of gratitude, was inadequate for its purpose. It consists of mere episodes, and they are related without proportion. It is also a royalist pamphlet, and a protest against the Concordat of 1801, between Pius VII. and Napoleon, rather than a history. We shall, however, make use of it in this article for some details passed over by Canon Plasse.

It is perhaps right that the bounty of England to the French should be recorded by the nation that received, rather than by that which conferred the benefits; yet it is strange that a matter of such magnitude as the free gift, to the exiles of a nation with which England was at war, of more than two million pounds sterling, should neither have found a special historian in England, nor anything beyond the merest incidental mention in English histories. In many respects this gift is more glorious to us as a nation than the twenty millions voted for negro emancipation. Yet Alison has no space for it in his lengthy record of the affairs of Europe; Knight's enormous folios on the reign of George III. contain not more than a dozen lines on the subject; and the late Mr. Greene, in his larger History, while illustrating what he calls "the new humanity" by Howard's prison reforms, the trial of Warren Hastings, and the abolition of slavery, has not a word on the hospitality of Protestant England to the Catholic clergy of France.

Stranger still has been the apathy of Catholic writers with regard to an event of such interest and importance, from a religious point of view, as the residence in England, for many years together, of many thousand Catholic priests. Charles Butler, indeed, in his additions to the Historical Memoirs of English Catholics, published in 1821, gives five pages to the recep-

tion in England of the French Persecuted Clergy,* but he enters into no details as to the numbers, residence, or occupation of the exiles. Those who have followed him have added nothing to our information, as may be seen by a quotation from Canon Flanagan's *History of the Church in England* :—

The tide of the exiled clergy [he writes] was far beyond all the need of the missions: it soon amounted to no fewer than eight thousand. It was accompanied by a vast number of the French nobility, and nearly all, both nobles and clergy, were cast penniless upon the shores of England. Seldom or never has England presented so noble a spectacle as upon that occasion. It rose superior to its old prejudices and received them all with open arms; one thousand of them found a shelter in the King's house of Winchester, and the voluntary subscriptions that poured in being still insufficient, a large sum was annually voted for many years.†

In this short paragraph the whole subject is despatched. Could anything be more vague or unsatisfactory? How was the immigration caused? When did it begin, and when did it end? How much money was subscribed, how much voted by Parliament? How was it distributed? What is to be understood by "many years"? What was the occupation of the French clergy during their exile, what their conduct? What have been the results on the nation, or on the Catholic Church in England, of the presence of these thousands of confessors of the Catholic faith? Canon Flanagan answers none of these questions. His point of view was apparently the "need of the missions," and the supply being beyond the demand. So thoroughly, or so narrowly, does he keep to his immediate subject, that, though he quotes the generous words in which Abbé Barruel testifies to the favourable impression made on the French clergy by the English Catholics, he has forgotten to speak of the impression made on English Catholics and Protestants by the magnificent spectacle of ten thousand priests sacrificing their all for conscience sake. This omission is all the more to be regretted in that he gives two pages to a history of the Blanchard Schism, the one unfortunate blot on the glorious record of the French Church in England.

More unaccountable still is the silence of Provost Husenbeth in his *Life of Bishop Milner*. When Milner was pastor of St. Peter's, Winchester, more than seven hundred French priests lived in community for four years at the King's house in that city, and many more in private lodgings. Milner was intimately concerned in these arrangements, as Canon Plasse shows. Yet

* Vol. iv. chap. 78, § 5. Four of the nine pages of this section relate the sufferings of the English nuns.

† Vol. ii. p. 412.

the only reference to the matter by his biographer is that Milner translated a letter by a French bishop, and allowed the French clergy to celebrate in his church a solemn requiem at the death of Louis XVI., at which the English pastor preached; yet Milner's later action, as bishop, against the French schism, or Blanchardists, is related in detail. The reasons for Dr. Husenbeth's ill-proportioned treatment of Milner's relations with the French clergy are, doubtless, that he was a witness of the bishop's zeal against the poor and misguided remnant of the exiles, while of the earlier and heroic days he knew little. Still, the documents used by Canon Plasse were accessible in 1862, when Husenbeth wrote, and belonged to his subject.

We have made these remarks, not in disparagement of excellent books, but to show that Canon Plasse breaks new ground. He has written an important chapter in English as well as in French history, and his volumes should be read with equal interest and glow of pride by French and English, by Protestants and Catholics. In a visit to England in 1864 the subject first presented itself to his mind. He set himself to learn English, made seven subsequent journeys across the Channel, and visited most of the places in England, Scotland, and Ireland, where his exiled brethren had resided, worked hard in the MS. collections of the Record Office and British Museum, and in the archives of the old Catholic churches, took personally many photographs of places and old prints, and with the materials gathered by all these labours has constructed a narrative full of interest and edification.* Naturally he has written from a French point of view. There are descriptions in his book that are superfluous for English readers; and he has given a space to the investigation of the names and dioceses of exiles, which in an English adaptation of his book we should gladly see devoted to some biographical details regarding their English hosts and friends. We regretted also to find so little use made of contemporary English literature, or of English biographies bearing on those times; but after having ourselves sought to complete our knowledge by a pretty long search through recent historians, and the memoirs of such men as Pitt, Percival, Canning, Wilberforce, we confess to have found little to repay our toil, except in the Parliamentary debates. In the brief sketch we now attempt we must be understood to refer to Canon Plasse for the proofs of what we state, unless when we indicate other sources.†

* Eighteen full-page engravings add much to the value of these volumes.

† These volumes have the ordinary French defect of being without index. We have sometimes arrived at our conclusions by supplementing one statement or document by another. Canon Plasse is abundant, and no doubt accurate in his references, but he has not always given us the summaries or totals we should desire.

The causes and progress of the French Revolution are too well known to need repeating here. The exile of the French clergy, to which we restrict ourselves, was not, like that of most of the laity, a spontaneous, or a merely political movement. In July, 1790, the Civil Constitution of the clergy had been voted, which threw all who accepted it into open schism with the Holy See. An oath to observe it was required from all who held office or benefice, and in November deprivation and other penalties were voted against the non-jurists. In the assembly, out of 290 ecclesiastics, only 96 swore, and 25 of these almost immediately retracted. In Paris, out of 800, 600 refused the oath; in the provinces 50,000 out of 60,000. On January 21st, 1791, the king, Louis XVI., weakly signed the bill of ejectment against the clergy who refused the oath. On the same day, two years later, he was beheaded, but not before he had bitterly regretted his weakness. It is interesting to learn from an English source, that when Abbé Edgeworth told the king, just before his death, that the exiled clergy were being received and sheltered in England, the king exclaimed with emotion: "Ah! la généreuse nation, la généreuse nation."* As the revolution proceeded the enemies of religion were not satisfied with depriving the Catholic clergy of their benefices, or forbidding them to minister to their former flocks. By a law of August 26, 1792, all non-jurant ecclesiastics were to quit the country in a fortnight, under pain of transportation to French Guiana. Three francs a day were to be given them for the expenses of a daily journey of thirty miles to the frontier. If they returned they would be awarded ten years' imprisonment. The sick, and those over sixty years old, were exempted from banishment, but had to assemble in a place assigned to them in each department. The exiles had passports, yet multitudes were massacred *en route* at Rheims, Meaux, Lyons, Versailles, Caen, and other places, and those who escaped were pillaged and stripped, and arrived in exile, for the most part in absolute penury. Naturally those in the northern parts of France fled to the nearest place of safety, the Channel Islands—French in language, though English in nationality and religion—and the southern shores of England.

Let it be remembered that this expulsion of 50,000 priests was endured by them voluntarily, in the sense that it could have been avoided by taking an illicit oath, and let us judge by it such passages as the following of Carlyle. Describing the first beginnings of the French Revolution, he says: "Our Church stands haltered, dumb, like a dumb ox, lowing only for

* Journal of Miss Porter in 1796, quoted in the Journal of Mary Frampton, published in 1885, p. 89.

provender (of tithes); content if it can have that, or with dumb stupor expecting its farther doom." * Had he said, "as a sheep dumb before its shearer," he would have been a truer historian. But, to his disgrace, Carlyle, in all his graphic pictures of the French Revolution, has not a word of admiration or sympathy for the exiled priests, nor does he do more than just allude to the decree of their expulsion. In one place only he mentions "dissident ejected priests, unconquerable martyrs according to some, incurable chicaning traitors according to others," † and does not add a word or a fact to manifest his own or to form his reader's judgment as to which epithet was deserved. It is to the honour of England that from the beginning no doubt on this point was entertained. The exiles were welcomed, if not as martyrs, or confessors, yet as noble sufferers for conscience. Some words spoken by an Anglican minister to the very first exiles expressed the sentiment of this nation. "Certain French priests," wrote an eyewitness, "just landed, went out of curiosity into a Protestant Church during the evening service. The clergyman was preaching, but seeing the strange priests enter he interrupted his sermon, and addressed them in French: "Gentlemen, I admire the firmness and courage you have shown in the persecution of which you are the victims, and the dangers to which you have been exposed. May God reward you, and grant you all prosperity in future." He then bowed low to them and continued his sermon in English ‡

The total number of priests who took refuge in England was about 10,000, but these did not all arrive at once, or leave at the same period, and owing to poverty and want the mortality was fearful. According to Abbé de Lubersac, between the years 1792 and 1802 about 1250 French priests died in Great Britain and the Channel Islands. § Various causes increased or diminished the numbers in the country. When the banishment was decreed, many who did not leave France at first, but hid themselves, and ministered secretly to their people, were afterwards obliged to fly. Others, after expatriation, returned. The persecution in France raged with more or less violence according to the predominance of political parties, or the good or ill success of the wars, and fears of invasion. Some of the exiled left England for foreign missions, others after a time sought countries

* Carlyle's "French Revolution," part i. book ii. ch. 3.

† Part ii. book iii. ch. 4.

‡ "Memoirs of Canon Baston," of Rouen, written in 1793, and quoted by Canon Plasse, i. 152.

§ Journal, p. 14. Between two and three hundred subsequently, up to 1817. Plasse, ii. 285. Six bishops died here before the Concordat, and after it nine, who refused to return to France.—*Ibid.* ii. 238.

where the religion and language were more congenial. On the other hand, some who had turned their steps at first to Catholic countries, and found but little welcome, were drawn to England by the report of the hospitality accorded to their countrymen. And when French armies invaded Belgium, Holland, Switzerland or Italy in 1794-5 many French refugees fled for safety to England. Perhaps there is no means of ascertaining the exact number at any one period, since, though lists have been preserved of such as received relief, many more were residing here at their own cost. In September 1792, before the period fixed for expatriation had elapsed, it was calculated that there were 1000 priests in Jersey, and 1,500 in England. In October the Channel Islands were overflowing with as many as 2,500 priests, and 2,150 more in England. The number went on rapidly increasing, and in 1795 there were 8,000 on the lists of relief. Then many returned to France, and the numbers in England fluctuated. At the beginning of 1800 there were 5,621 receiving help, besides many more maintaining themselves. With the Concordat came the general return. At the end of 1801 the number helped was 3,060, at the end of 1802 only 876 remained in England. Government grants continued to be made till 1817, but it was merely to a remnant of political or religious irreconcilables. The great immigration lasted about ten years, and the average number of priests at any one time in Great Britain was about 6,000.

How, then, was this influx of "popish priests," of a rival and hated nation, received by Protestant England? Canon Plasse testifies that, though there were not wanting some brutalities or excesses on the part of the lower orders, and some expressions of bigotry on the part of a few obscure writers, yet the nation as a whole, both by word and act, extended to them a cordial welcome. Burke had nobly defended the character of the higher French clergy in his *Reflections on the French Revolution*, published in November, 1790, and in a great speech in Parliament on the 6th of May, 1791, he had pointed to the shores of England as a refuge against the oppression which he saw menacing all that was faithful to religion and honour in France. But it was not only the party influenced by Burke, or the followers of Pitt, who gave welcome or sympathy to the persecuted priests. Not one voice was raised in Parliament against their arrival, and when later on it was found necessary to grant a large subsidy for their support, the money was voted year after year without a murmur or a dissentient voice.

On the 15th of September, 1792, Sir Samuel Romilly wrote: "It is impossible to walk a hundred yards in any public street here (*i.e.*, in London) without meeting two or three French priests. Who would have conceived that, at the close of the

eighteenth century, we should see in the most civilized country in Europe (*i.e.*, France) all the horrors of political proscription and religious persecution united?" And in another place: "How France came to act thus, and whether it was not to be expected from such 'civilization' we do not inquire; but it was surely as great a phenomenon that priests should be thus walking unmolested in London twelve years after the Gordon riots."

In December, 1792, an Alien Bill was introduced in the House of Lords, and subsequently passed both Houses. Its object was not to exclude foreigners or refugees, but to detect revolutionists. Foreigners flocking to England were of three classes; first, the priests banished from their country; secondly, those of the old régime who had left France of their own accord (*les émigrés*); and thirdly, those who were coming to do mischief and propagate the new notions. The Bill proposed that a description should be taken of all foreigners, that they should be furnished with passports to the places to which they wished to go, that suspected aliens should be sent out of the country by an order of the Secretary of State, and that aliens in general could be obliged by proclamation of the King to reside in certain districts. In the debates on this Bill all the speakers, both for the Government and the Opposition, spoke with the greatest respect of the unfortunate priests. The Marquis of Lansdowne opposed the Bill, but in doing so he declared he was influenced by no one motive that was personal to himself:

He must, however, acknowledge that himself and his family, in common with all Englishmen of any distinction, had experienced at the hands of many of these unfortunate people, the greatest kindness, attention and hospitality: to the French clergy in particular they were greatly indebted on this head, for it was well known by all foreigners that in France it was chiefly the clergy who did the honours of the nation. These worthy and hospitable men, driven from their homes and from their property, had claims upon the generosity of Englishmen, which had been most handsomely admitted, and which, he trusted, would continue to be admitted, until such time as France should become more just to a most deserving body of subjects, or until England should have furnished them with the means of forming settlements in Canada, and of there providing for their future support.

Lord Grenville, Secretary for Foreign Affairs, replied that he would not ask the leave of France for England to bestow upon these unfortunate men whatever, in their liberality, Englishmen should be disposed to give them.* The sympathy extended to the emigrants was one of the charges made against England by France in her declaration of war in January, 1793, and Lord

* Hansard's "Parliamentary History," vol. xxx. pp. 151, 154.

Grenville said, "he was so far from denying the fact, that he considered it the highest glory to his countrymen, who had felt for the wants of the distressed, and had expressed their sympathy by noble and generous benefactions." *

We must refer to Canon Plasse for the details of these benefactions. We can give the merest outline. The movement of relief was begun by a French bishop, one of the earliest of the *immigrés*. Monseigneur Jean-François de la Marche, Count as well as Bishop of St. Pol de Léon, in Brittany, was from the beginning to the end of the persecution, the visible Providence of the French refugees, both lay and cleric, and the life and soul of all the committees for their relief. We regret that our space does not allow us to speak of his adventures, his labours, and his virtues.† He is called by Canon Plasse "*Le Précurseur*." He had been obliged to fly from France, and had landed penniless in England on February 28, 1791. But he had been hospitably received at Lulworth Castle, and had made the acquaintance of many English Catholics, as well as of Edmund Burke and of several of his friends. He gave himself at once to the work of befriending his fellow-victims, and through him the charities of English Catholics and others were distributed during the year and a half that elapsed between his landing and the great influx of priests which began in September, 1792, after the King's deposition, the decree of banishment, and the massacres of Paris. Early in September committees of English gentlemen were formed in Jersey, Dover, Lewes, Bristol, Canterbury, Winchester, and London, to receive the wretched priests, protect them from outrage or imposture, house and clothe or forward them inland. It is to the honour of the Anglican clergy that in this work, as well as in subsequent efforts at relief, they took an active and persevering part. The name of the Rev. Mr. Sneyd, rector of Jevington, near Eastbourne, deserves special remembrance. It was soon seen that an appeal must be made to the nation. More than one committee was formed in London, and Edmund Burke drew up the address of that meeting, which ultimately absorbed the other committees, and became the agent of the Government in the dispensation of its succours. Naturally, however, until private efforts were exhausted or proved insufficient, the Government did not interfere, except in one important particular—the granting of houses or places of refuge. The Government also entertained a plan of forwarding the refugees to Canada, and endowing them with lands, and for this purpose sent com-

* Hansard's "*Parliamentary History*," vol. xxx. p. 470.

† We are glad to refer to an article in *Merry England* for December 1886, for an interesting notice of this excellent man.

missioners to the colony; but the scheme proved impracticable, and was abandoned.

The names of the relief committee are interesting, and would repay an investigation that Canon Plasse has not given to them. We were agreeably surprised to find among them some of the leaders of the Evangelical or "Clapham sect," as they were then called, as Henry Thornton, M.P. for Southwark, and William Wilberforce, M.P. for Hull. But our admiration cooled on consulting the *Life of Wilberforce*, by his son, the Bishop of Winchester. It appears that this zeal for Catholic priests was not quite disinterested. The biographer explains the matter as follows:—

The Convention had bestowed on Mr. Wilberforce in the course of this summer (of 1792) the doubtful honour of French citizenship. "I am considering," he writes to Mr. Babington, "how to prevent the ill effect which this vote might have upon our Abolition cause." He found the opportunity in an attempt to raise subscriptions for the emigrant clergy." Wilberforce entered in his journal: "Friday, 20 Sept. 1792. To town to the French clergy public meeting, and consented to be on the committee at Burke's request, partly to do away French citizenship."*

Let, him, however, have the credit of the word "partly." Though it does not appear from his diaries, which are very minute, that he attended many meetings, yet an entry nearly four years later proves that he was, and was known to be, a real sympathizer with the sufferings of the exiles:

March 5, 1796.—Received a letter stating the distress of the French emigrant clergy. *Kept awake at night.* Thought much of them, and formed a plan. March 6th.—After church saw the Bishop of St. Pol de Léon and several other persons on emigrant business. Then with Henry Thornton, by appointment, at my desire, to Lady Buckinghamshire's. She and Miss Macnamara earnest about the poor emigrants.†

The names of at least two Catholic gentlemen appear in the committee—Robert Barnewall and J. J. Angerstein. But the two who showed most zeal and perseverance were the Marquis of

* "*Life of Wilberforce*," p. 108 (ed. 1868).

† Is not this a slip of Wilberforce's pen, or a mistake of his copyist, for Lady Buckingham's? The Marchioness of Buckingham was, from the beginning to the end, full of zeal for the French emigrants, as well as the Marquis. She was also specially connected with Miss Macnamara about this time in several works of relief. The latter lady is characteristically called by the Abbé de Lubersac, Madame de Machemara, and then La Marquise de Machemara ("*Journal*," pp. 87, 88).

Buckingham and John Wilmot, the chairman. George, first Earl of Buckingham, had been twice Viceroy of Ireland, first as Lord Temple. In every possible way, by money, by exertions, by voice and influence—he befriended the exiles. When the University of Oxford printed and distributed to the priests an edition of the Latin Vulgate New Testament, consisting of 2,000 copies, the Marquis had 2,000 more printed at his own expense. John Eardley Wilmot was born at Derby in 1748, and was educated at Westminster and at Oxford. In 1783 he became a Master in Chancery, and at the close of the American war was appointed commissioner for settling the claims of the Loyalists. He was member for Coventry from 1790. From 1792 to June, 1806, he was chairman of the Central Committee, and gave himself entirely to his great work of mercy. It was principally with him the Government communicated, and he acted throughout with indefatigable zeal and the most tender courtesy. His fifteen years of obscure toil entitle him to rank in the memory of good men with Howard and Wilberforce, and so many more philanthropists of whom England is proud. But we are anticipating.

The Central Committee entered into communication with all local committees, as well as with members of the Government (William Pitt was a member of the Committee). The Bishop of St. Pol, who had hitherto been privately collecting money with an English priest named Meynell, explained to the Committee what had been done. He had 907 priests on his list, and thought there were another 100 in immediate want, besides 500 who were yet able to maintain themselves, but whose means would soon be exhausted. Fresh victims of the persecution were landing every hour. There were 1,000 at Jersey. The number seeking refuge would be doubled and trebled before long. He had already sent £150 to Jersey, £150 to Brussels, and £420 to different parts of England. He was in correspondence with the various bishops and vicars-general whose clergy were in England. The Committee did not hesitate to ask him to be distributor of all the alms collected, he being responsible to them. The Bishop had taken up his residence at 10, Little Queen Street, Holborn, at the house of a Catholic widow named Silburne. This house became the headquarters of all disbursements, whether in money or clothes, Mrs. Silburne devoting herself to the distributions in kind. The Committee, which first met at Freemasons' Tavern, in Great Queen Street, afterwards held its meetings three times a week at the Bishop's residence.

The first public subscription amounted to over £32,000, and when this and other private donations were exhausted, the King called on the archbishops and bishops to have a national collec-

tion, made by clergy and churchwardens at domicile after a sermon preached in the churches. This was in May, 1793, and the amount realized was £41,000. A Catholic subscription and a special ladies' collection may be mentioned in addition. It is calculated that by the middle of 1793 about £75,000 had been given to the clergy and £11,000 to the laity. It was soon apparent that private generosity would be unable to cope with wants which went on always increasing, and seemed likely to last some time. The matter was therefore taken up by the Government; and in December, 1793, £7,830 a month was allotted to the clergy, and £560 to the laity. The lay grant was soon increased to £1,000 a month. Burthened as they were with the cost of the war with France, the Government declared positively for a time that this grant should not be augmented; yet when the number of lay emigrants greatly increased, it was found impossible to keep the resolution, and in July 1794 £1,500 a month, in December 1794, £2,000, and in February 1795, £3,000 was allotted for the laity. In December 1794 the grant to ecclesiastics was raised to £9,000 a month, and though this was quite insufficient, it was found impossible, owing to the cost of the war and the price of provisions, to add to it. Canon Plasse has carefully examined the accounts of the Committee, now in the Record Office, and has quoted many particulars, but he has nowhere given the totals, year by year, distinguishing between the clerical and lay grants. Neither in the Treasury nor in the Audit Office do complete series of finance accounts go back beyond the beginning of the present century. No doubt a calculation might be made from the records of the Central Committee. Charles Butler, however, tells us that he learnt from the secretary of the Committee that in June, 1806, the sums voted in Parliament had reached the total of £1,864,825; and the grants, though in greatly diminished ratio, continued for another ten years. It may be said, without danger of exaggeration, that the Government grants to French priests alone, were considerably over £2,000,000.* To this must be added the sums subscribed voluntarily, already mentioned, and private gifts of unknown hands. Canon Plasse, after long scrutiny, says: "These anonymous gifts were incessant, and continued until the return of the clergy to France, and

* From 1794 to 1799, both inclusive, the lists given in the "Annual Register" show an expenditure of £870,719 on the clergy and laity. In Marshall's "Digest" there is a summary of expenditure in "Suffering Clergy and Laity," in each year from 1800 to 1831. This includes, however, the relief of Toulonese, Corsican, and San Domingo emigrants. The summary from 1800 to 1816 is £2,705,869, which is about £2,000,000 for the French clergy and laity. But to this we must add the grants from 1793 to 1800.

amounted to more than the total of both subscriptions and collections (made in churches).*

It may be said, perhaps, that the Government grants were an act not of generosity but of necessity. The emigrants were not chargeable on the local rates, nor could they be allowed to die of starvation in the streets. This is true; yet many things show that it would be most unjust to attribute the grants to grudging necessity. There was no necessity to receive the strangers, and there were countries in Europe which refused to do so. Or they could have been passed on quickly, with some formal grant of land in one of our colonies, and left to shift for themselves. But beyond this they were treated throughout with all possible consideration and courtesy, and their claim was always spoken of, not as that of paupers, but of sufferers for conscience. An English lady, Mrs. Hannats, addressing her countrywomen, said: "Charity knows no party. We plead, not for the faith of the French priests, but for their wants. But, let it not be forgotten, had those men been willing to sacrifice their conscience to their temporal interest, they would not be now in this country."† The King also, in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (July 17, 1793) says that the priests sought shelter in England "alone for conscience sake."‡ Sir Henry Mildmay, M.P. for Winchester, even when bringing in a Bill against conventual institutions in 1800, speaks of "that unfortunate and meritorious class of men who have preferred the sacrifice of all their temporal interests, and actual expulsion from their native country, to the abandonment of their principles and their religion."§

With these sentiments, which seem to have prevailed universally, we are not surprised that M. Plasse bears testimony to and gives many examples of the great courtesy extended to the priests. One instance may be quoted. An English frigate, the *Indefatigable*, on August 7, 1798, captured a French corvette, the *Vaillante*. The captain, Sir Edward Pellew, visited his prize, and noticing, among a large number of convicts who were in the French vessel, some of a different appearance to the rest, he asked who they were. One of them replied that they were twenty-five priests whom the Directory was sending to Guiana. The captain at once lifted his hat, and bowing to them, said with emotion: "I am happy, gentlemen, to deliver you from an almost certain death. You are the richest prize I have yet made." He then had the other convicts and the French sailors conveyed to his own frigate, leaving the priests in the corvette, and choosing the Catholic men of his crew to navigate her.

* Plasse, vol. i. p. 251.

† *Ibid.* p. 246.

‡ April, 1793. See Plasse, vol. i. p. 242.

§ Hansard, xxxv. p. 340.

When they arrived at Plymouth they were not only set at liberty, but put at once on the list of those who received weekly maintenance.*

We cannot enter into the details of the distribution of the alms, which fill the greater part of Canon Plasse's book. No distinction was made of rank, except between the bishops and other priests. There were thirty bishops in England, but the Archbishop of Aix and Narbonne, and the Bishops of Montpellier, Rodez, Perigueux and De l'Escar, having means of their own, would not receive help.† The bishops received ten guineas a month, the other priests thirty-five shillings or two guineas. Distributors were appointed in different districts, and these were invariably French priests recommended by their bishops, and appointed by the bishop of St Pol, to whom the general superintendence was committed. He was responsible to the committee, and they to the Treasury. Every precaution was taken against fraud, either on the part of the distributors or recipients. Besides the weekly doles, great care was given to the sick and the demented, and extra sums granted to extraordinary cases and for travelling expenses, when change of residence was necessary.

One of the most interesting features of the narrative is the account given of the various houses allotted by the Government for residence of large bodies of priests. A house at Fortune, near Gosport, was set apart at the beginning of the immigration, and received as many as 250 in October, 1792. In April, 1793, these were removed to Winchester, where there were others already assembled, and being joined by 200 from Jersey, they made up a community of 600, which was increased to 700 by the end of the year. These all lived together, and 150 more were scattered through the city. The residence of this large body of priests was an unfinished palace begun by Charles II., and called the King's House. It is now used as a barrack. During the former wars with France it had been set apart to receive French prisoners. It was now repaired and sufficiently furnished at the expense of the Government, and the canons, curés, and vicaires of France found themselves suddenly converted, in a Protestant country and by a Protestant Government, into a religious community, under the Abbé Martin, a religious of the Congregation of Eudistes, and formerly superior of the Grand Séminaire of Lisieux. Officials and servants had been provided, but the priests found they could manage domestic matters better and more economically themselves, and reduced the expenses of this great community to about 5s. 6d. a head per week. A party of 200 transformed themselves into artisans, and a carpet or tapestry

* Plasse, vol. i. p. 133 ; ii. p. 94.

† De Lubersac, p. 20.

manufactory was established by the aid of the Marchioness of Buckingham. She herself managed the sale of their work, and the profits were their own. None were idle. Lectures and conferences on theology and Holy Scripture were given; some young ecclesiastics finished their education, and were ordained; retreats were made and preached. Besides the English Catholic Church in the city, there were two chapels in the King's House. High mass and vespers were sung on Sundays and feast-days, and of course many masses were offered daily. Perpetual adoration was kept up from half-past five in the morning to eight at night.

All this continued for three years and a half, when, owing to the fear of invasion, the King's House was required as a barrack, and the community was broken up. Some were dispersed, but three other houses were provided by the Government for those who preferred community life; one at Reading for 300, another at Thame for 110, and a third at Paddington for 60. It is rather amusing to find that, though there had been no scandal, the antipathy between Normans and Bretons had so far manifested itself that it was judged more prudent to place the Normans at Reading and Paddington, under Norman superiors, the Bretons at Thame under a Breton. Canon Plasse gives many interesting particulars regarding these establishments, as well as concerning a military school established at Penn, near Beaconsfield, principally by the influence of Edmund Burke, for the sons, mostly orphans, of French Royalist officers.

The dispersed clergy sought by every means in their power to maintain themselves as teachers of French or Latin, music, drawing, or mathematics, and even as tailors, shoemakers, clock-makers, or field labourers. Charming details are given of their gaiety, as well as sad pictures of their distress.* Some found more congenial and appropriate occupation in the spiritual care of their countrymen. The Government gave permission to erect chapels for public worship, and the registers, still preserved at the French Church of St. Louis in London, tell of the work performed. The Bishop of Coutances was at that time the diocesan of our Channel Islands, and it was from him, of course,

* Mr. J. Winter Jones, in his "Preface to the List of Books of Reference in the Reading-room of the British Museum," says:—"The French Revolution led to a considerable increase in the number of readers during the first years of that extraordinary convulsion. Nearly one-half of those admitted in the year 1795 consisted of French refugees. Among them were the Archbishop of Bordeaux, the Bishops of Uzes and of Troyes, the Count de St. Cyr . . . with a long list of abbés and men of less note, all of whom sought relief from the *ennui* of their exile in the reading-room of the British Museum."

that jurisdiction emanated. Bishop Douglas, the Vicar Apostolic of the London District, constituted the Bishop of St. Pol de Léon his vicar-general in all that related to the French; and it was he who appointed priests to serve the various chapels in London, at Southampton, Lymington, Romsey, Hardway, near Gosport, and Winchester. For an account of these chapels and the zealous labours of the priests we must refer to Canon Plasse. We will say a few words about one that he has passed over. A French chapel was opened in Winchester in 1798, after the breaking up of the King's House community, and was quite distinct from the two chapels used by the clergy there, as well as from the English Catholic Church in St. Peter's Street. It is not mentioned by Dr. Milner in his "History of Winchester," published just before its opening, nor alluded to by Dr. Husenbeth in his "Life of Milner," nor by Canon Plasse; but it is called in the register preserved in the archives in London, "*Chapelle Catholique Française à Winchester.*" It is amusing to see how the priests were sometimes puzzled as to the ecclesiastical position of England. As all acts of baptism, marriage, &c., might be important after the hoped-for return to France, the French priests took care at each entry to repeat in full all that would serve to explain their acts during their exile. M. Auger, the priest in charge at Winchester, declares that he is *cure* of such a parish in France, that he is cruelly banished for his faith, that he is *missionnaire apostolique* in England, that he is appointed by the Bishop of St. Pol de Léon, whom he calls vicar-general of Monseigneur l'Evêque de Londres; afterwards (finding that this designation is incorrect) Evêque de Centurie et Missionnaire Apostolique. It is not till the third year that Bishop Douglas gets his true title of Vicar Apostolic. Two other matters of some interest may be here stated, since there is no mention of them in Canon Plasse, and we have sought in this notice to supplement as well as to abridge his work. One is the appointment of a French army chaplain; the other a mission given to French prisoners of war. A register of baptisms, marriages and deaths was kept in Southampton from December, 1792, at the first landing of the emigrants, to December, 1804. The chapel and register after a year's interval were transferred to Lymington, and date from January, 1806, to December, 1807, and again from July, 1808, to July, 1813. Here several names are English and Irish, since there was no other chapel in that neighbourhood; whereas in Winchester the French priest's jurisdiction was confined to the exiles. With the death of M. Le Tellier, the priest who had served at Southampton and Lymington for ten years, the register ceases; but we then come upon the interesting fact of an army chaplain, though only for the foreign troops in

English pay. In 1814, and to August 28, 1815, the registers are signed by the *Prêtre Missionnaire Apostolique et Chapelain des Troupes du Foreign Dépôt à Lymington*. At the final fall of Napoleon and the breaking up of the foreign contingent the chaplain no doubt returned to France. He leaves a note, that all future entries must be made by the Rev. Mr. Brown, resident at Pyle Wells House, near Lymington.

The account of the mission to French prisoners is given by De Lubersac. He does not mention the date, but it was before 1802 when he wrote. Thirty thousand French prisoners filled the prisons of Porchester, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Bristol, Norman Cross, Chatham, &c. Their wretched spiritual condition moved the compassion of the Bishop of St. Pol, who was the first mover in all good works. He gathered a number of experienced and zealous priests, got special leave from the Government, and sent them to the various prisons. Though as priests and as royalists they met with contempt and insult from the majority of the prisoners, on the other hand they had great success and consolation with others. It is a touching incident that when the good missionaries made known to the Bishop and other priests the frightful state of nudity in which they found many of the prisoners, a subscription was opened among the poor banished priests for their relief, and these men, who had scarcely decent clothing for themselves, deprived themselves of all that was not absolutely necessary to clothe their more necessitous fellow-countrymen.* This is but one out of many traits of generosity, which we regret to pass over.

Their generosity in assisting each other was only equalled by their gratitude to the English. More than a year before the Government grants, and before any of the great public subscriptions had been made, at the end of the year 1792, the Bishop of Léon thus addressed the French priests in England :

May the God of mercies shower down His chosen blessings on a people who seem chosen by Him to vindicate the violated laws of nature and humanity ! In the days of French power and glory England often disputed the field of battle, and her efforts were often crowned with success in asserting her right to the dominion of both seas. But she offers to us a more glorious spectacle, a triumph of a higher nature. She has opened her ports to you, she considers you not as strangers, she sees you are unhappy, and she embraces you as brethren and friends. The English are not startled at your numbers ; they think the best use they can make of their great opulence is to afford succour to a greater number of persons in distress. . . . In the seaports, in cities, in villages, in the isles [Jersey, &c.], and the capital, what an eagerness to anticipate and relieve our wants. Citizens of every rank,

* De Lubersac : "Journal," p. 101.

pressing forward to welcome a colony of unfortunate exiles with a brotherly affection, were more happy in the offer of their services than you in receiving them, anxious to conceal the hand that ministered to your wants, and hurt only by the reserve that hid them. . . . These attentions, this liberality, were not confined to any particular description of men, but common to the whole nation, and to every class that composes it: to the corporations, the chapters, the universities, to the palaces of the rich and the humble cottages of the poor.*

We would not, of course, be understood, from what has been said or quoted, to assert that all was peace and charity in this unexpected bringing together of French and English, Catholic priests and prejudiced Protestants. There were some outbreaks of violence, some ebullitions of bigotry. But considering the long enmity between England and France, and the war that was raging at that very time; considering also the ignorance and prejudice that prevailed, and the recent outbreak in the Gordon riots, the forbearance and generosity of England to these outcasts of her old rival, and priests of her discarded faith, were as remarkable as the gratitude of the French priests was sincere and their conduct edifying. The presence of so many priests in England created great alarm in some minds; but good feeling prevailed, and prevented the panic from spreading. There was a Mr. Jones in those days, as there has been a Spooner and a Whalley in our own. In a debate on Monastic Institutions in 1804, Mr. Jones spoke as follows:—"A celebrated character had said of the French Revolution that the age of chivalry was gone. So would he say that the age of Popery had commenced. He could not but think that danger was to be apprehended from 5,000 priests being in the country." But Mr. Jones was answered by Mr. Sheridan:

A foolish alarm had been sent abroad respecting the number of emigrant clergy now in this country. They were said to amount to 5,000, and persons had even been absurd enough to say that in one county alone they had converted 2,000 housemaids. How this wonderful conversion was brought about he could not well conceive. The emigrant priests spoke but little English, and our housemaids spoke as little French.†

Sheridan was right. Not only their ignorance of the language, but the fact that they were enjoying English hospitality prevented the French priests from making any active efforts to spread the Catholic faith. But their Masses, their prayers, their sufferings, and the good odour of their example, have not been without

* Milner's translation.

† Hansard, vol. xxxv.

effect in dispelling prejudice and drawing grace upon the country. Their edifying conduct was readily and universally acknowledged both by friends and enemies at the time. Now that we look back on this episode of the Church's history, we perceive in it, not dimly, the divine purpose, purifying as well as vindicating the Church of France, and giving to England an opportunity of national reparation to that Catholic Church she had so deeply outraged for more than two centuries. Carlyle, in describing the Church in France before the Revolution, writes with admiration of the age of Canossa, "when kings stood barefoot in penance-shirt," but sneers at the Church as changed since then, and making patrons of her kings; and laughs contemptuously at the "Sorbonne, mumbling only jargon of dotage, and no longer leading the consciences of men." As to the latter charge, it ill befits a writer who himself took the rôle of one crying in the wilderness. Is doctrine that has ceased to be popular necessarily jargon of dotage? Is the disbelief of either fools or "philosophes" an evidence of falsehood? If the Catholic faith ceased, in a great measure, to lead the consciences of men towards the end of the eighteenth century, it certainly had not ceased to hold the consciences of its teachers in France. The sincerity and earnestness of the faith that made them endure spoliation and exile is beyond cavil; and, to us at least, it is a grander spectacle to see 50,000 priests (for that was the number of the non-jurants) going willingly forth to banishment, and living in toil and penury for years, than to see even a proud emperor doing penance against his will. It is for this reason we hope that Canon Plasse's volumes will be read and studied both in England and in France. Written from a French point of view, and consisting in great part of translations into French of English documents, they will not bear translation into English in their present form; but we should welcome an English adaptation, supplemented from English sources, as an important addition to our historical literature, both civil and religious.

T. E. BRIDGETT, C.SS.R.

ART. IX.—THE LOST, STRAYED AND STOLEN OF OUR CATHOLIC POOR CHILDREN.

OF the many humiliating and distressing sights to be met with daily in the richest and most populous of our large towns, there is none more saddening and more frequent than that of the ill-clad, ill-washed, and ill-fed street arab.

He is indeed ubiquitous, and his presence, with all its afflicting

detail, has long since grown familiar to us. We have, as it were, grown callous to the sight, and look upon his company as an unwholesome necessity. We have been so accustomed to live and work amongst them that their absence would astound us, while their presence has become to us a human landmark in our daily occupations and journeys through life. Yet, with it all, we know little of them, save that they exist and increase in number, that they are living pictures of untold suffering, misery and want; that they are one of a family which lies hidden from our sight in some damp, dark, fetid room or cellar, in a neighbourhood known to us only by name. At times, it is true, their haunts, mode of life and characteristics are set vividly before us by a special correspondent of some great daily newspaper, who, working the subject up into a thrilling and harrowing article, excites our curiosity, awakens our flagging sympathy, and rouses us to make impulsive use of generous resolutions. At other times we read of some great movement being set on foot with the object of reaching and affording relief, spiritual and temporal, to the thousands who fill our courts and alleys by night, and crowd our central thoroughfares by day. Again, our newspapers bring before us heartrending appeals, emanating from philanthropic societies, on behalf of the boy, the orphan, the deaf, the blind, the lame, the fallen, and others of that countless army of poor suffering souls, who eke out a miserable and precarious existence in all our large cities.

There is both instructive and interesting reading to be found in the annual reports published by these societies. The mind becomes enlightened on many subjects concerning which it had long been in darkness. To the superficial reader there is much that is comforting. He is struck with the energy and zeal displayed by "The Boys' Beadle" in his daily rounds in quest of the arab. He is cheered in reading that many have been rescued, that homes have been found for them. He is quite touched with the gratitude evinced by others in return for favours received. Every page glistens with hope, and is heavily laden with good deeds done. The last leaf, which contains the yearly balance sheet, is the only chilling page in the bright little volume. He will close the book with the conviction that the Society is doing a noble and benevolent work—that it should certainly be encouraged and supported.

But reflections far more serious and weighty than these arise from a perusal of these reports. They reveal the existence of an unfathomable social disease in our midst, which has been allowed to grow and spread until it has covered the whole surface of the three kingdoms, with its thousands upon thousands of helpless, abandoned, and neglected victims.

Abandoned, helpless, and neglected indeed they would remain if left to be dealt with under the existing legislative machinery. School Boards, Industrial and Reformatory Schools have proved insufficient in accommodation, in organization, and in scope to clear the streets of the class which is most in need of their help and protection. That they have done much is not to be denied, but that there is much more left still undone the present state of our streets bears cruel and convincing testimony. Private philanthropy has long since stepped in, and has worked with untiring zeal and energy. The result speaks volumes for the extent and magnitude of the evil it has taken upon itself to check and diminish. The appeals issued by these societies prove that an immense effort is constantly being made to deal with the neglected and deserted children of our cities. They reveal the existence of an organization widespread in its influence, uncontrolled in its operations, unlimited in authority and control over its subjects, and worked at the discretion and dictation of some half-dozen members of an executive committee, responsible in some measure that the funds lavished upon them have been disbursed for the furtherance of the objects in view, but responsible to no one as to the ways and means by which those objects are attained.

The growth of these foundations of voluntary houses for the waifs and strays of both sexes has been rapid. They are to be found in every city of the kingdom, aye, almost in every village, bearing testimony to the zeal of hundreds, the charity of thousands.

Of the number of children picked up annually by the officers of the homes and refuges there is no possible means of forming any reliable estimate. From Low's "Handbook to the Charities of London" (1886-7), an extract of some seventy voluntary boys' and girls' homes gives the following result :—

Inmates—over 14,000.

Annual Income—£225,000.

This number by no means exhausts the total number of similar institutions now flourishing in London. The *classified list of reformatory and preventive institutions* connected with the Reformatory and Refuge Union (1884) gives a total of 70 provincial voluntary homes, with 2,868 inmates. Of the number of homes unconnected with this Union there is no mention. That their number is very large, few of our readers will doubt. The more they have travelled the deeper will be their conviction that these institutions are ubiquitous, that every town in which they may have sojourned has a long list of local charities, and that a boys' and girls' refuge home inevitably forms an item in the list.

The management and general arrangements of these homes are as a rule eminently satisfactory from a material point of view. The inmates are well-fed, well-clothed, and usually well-behaved. They are doubtless instrumental in doing great good, in saving vast numbers who would assuredly have drifted into the ranks of those who fill our jails and infest our streets. From this point they are worthy of the support which is evidently dealt out to them with no stingy hand. The world is not too critical. It looks at general results achieved; it is not over-inquisitive as to the means used in their production. It first knew the waif as he stood, idle, ragged, and miserable, in the street, it can scarcely recognize him as he now appears, the bright, sharp, well-fed boy. This to it is a demonstration of practical philanthropy—a something gained for the money expended. It has few, if any, religious scruples, and for such as it has it will find speedy comfort and assurance in learning that "the chief aim" of these institutions is to reclaim and elevate the neglected and criminal classes, by educating them in the fear of God and in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

We Catholics, however, cannot afford to view the work carried on by the societies in so easy and superficial a light. The whole question is a very grave one from our point of view, and recent disclosures in Ireland and England have tended to strengthen the fears and doubts which were slowly rising in our minds. We have found out late, very late indeed, that Christian philanthropy is being used as a cloak to proselytism of the worst and most heinous description. The good name and fame deservedly enjoyed by many prominent Christian associations and institutions have been borrowed and made use of by latter-day founders of homes and refuges. They possess all the external qualifications of the former; they work apparently much on the same lines, only more noisily. The good they do, the converts they make are in perpetual evidence, either in public halls or in the columns of some weekly or monthly paper, which finds an extensive sale through the forced exertions of a small army of youths told off for the purpose to the various towns in the neighbourhood. It is with such spurious institutions as these we intend dealing in our present article. And before submitting and reviewing proofs of the mode of procedure adopted by them, we would first say a word on the cause and sources which bring so many thousands of our children within range of their hateful and pernicious power. For the mournful truth must be told: a large proportion of the waif and stray element is doubtlessly furnished by our own children. We have done much, and are daily making great sacrifices for our voluntary schools and missions, but little has yet been done for that

fearful residuum out of which the lost, strayed and stolen of our Catholic poor children are to be accounted for. Last year it was our painful privilege to be engaged for a considerable time in analyzing and tabulating a large number of census returns taken in Manchester and Salford. The object was in furtherance of an inquiry instituted by the Bishop of Salford, in order to find out the probable losses to the faith through such causes as proselytism, mixed marriages, workhouses, and other sources, such as the neglect and death of parents. We shall have occasion, later on, to refer to the revelations brought to light concerning proselytism; for the present we will confine ourselves to those exposed by the census-taking.

The estimated Catholic population of Manchester and Salford exceeds considerably 100,000. From various causes, which need not here be gone into, the returns sent in included but 74,952. A careful study of these census returns resulted in ascertaining the causes of danger to which children of an age from one to twenty were exposed, to be (1) from irreligious parents, (2) from mixed marriages, and (3) from careless and indifferent parents. The group of cases falling under each of these causes was further distinguished into several degrees of danger.* The degrees of danger were *extreme*, *great* and *danger*. The danger was to be considered *extreme* when from the returns filled in on the census sheets the child's soul was in imminent peril—where there appeared no human hope for his salvation so long as he remained in the midst of his irreligious or immoral surroundings; the parents were never at mass or their Easter duties, the children never at mass or a Catholic school, where, in a word, they, callous and heedless of their own spiritual welfare, seemed to be determined to drag by their example their children with them to perdition. The second degree, or *great danger*, was used for cases not far removed in significance of detail from the first—where a redeeming feature of conduct was to be noted from one or other member of the household, but where irreligious tendencies were paramount, and had already left disastrous traces behind them. Under the heading of *danger* simply, were classed those cases in which some ray of hope for the little ones existed, a home where religious feeling was traceable through the conduct of one or another of the family, but still where danger was lurking in the example set by a parent.

As to the causes of danger, that of *mixed marriages* bears

* To causes one and two three degrees of danger were given, to the third, that of careless and indifferent parents, but two, it being considered that in those cases where the third was required, they should come under the category of irreligious parents.

its own explanation. It is a fruitful and growing source of danger, and one which offers the least possible hope of successful remedies. That of *irreligious parents* included that class of people from which it would seem all religious feeling or belief had died out, especially when tabulated under the heading of *extreme and great danger*. *Careless and indifferent parents* were those of a class more often to be pitied than blamed, poverty, want of work, a drunken parent, combining to make the home one of misery and wretchedness. The children of this class were oftentimes regular in their attendance at school, and were more exposed to danger in the streets than in their own homes.

The following statistics and analysis of the condition of children under twenty-one give the results of the census-taking:

In *extreme danger* of loss of faith or practically lost to the faith.

Under 7	2,381	
" 16	2,130	
" 21	909	... 5,420

In *great danger*.

Under 7	1,208	
" 16	819	
" 21	314	... 2,341

In *danger*.

Under 7	885	
" 16	744	
" 21	283	... 1,912

The following tables show the result of the classification of cause, age and extent:—

	Age.	Extreme danger.	Great danger.	Danger.
Per irreligious parents.	under 7	1,631	791	144
	" 16	1,485	526	173
	" 21	731	177	80
		<hr/> 3,847	<hr/> 1,494	<hr/> 397 = 5,738
Per mixed marriages.	under 7	750	324	181
	" 16	645	199	160
	" 21	178	100	47
		<hr/> 1,573	<hr/> 623	<hr/> 388 = 2,584
Per careless and indifferent parents.	under 7		93	560
	" 16		94	411
	" 21		37	156
			<hr/> 224	<hr/> 1,127 = 1,351

Thus we have a gross total of 9,673 children under twenty-one

in various degrees of danger through the three causes specified. Of this number no less than 5,420 are in extreme danger of the loss of faith. For these there appeared but little earthly hope. Many have been born in sin, all have been reared in its midst, and have grown familiar with its various aspects through the daily examples furnished them by their parents. Their young lives have been lives of misery, suffering and degradation—the future apparently awaiting them is one of sin, crime and riot. They seem to be outside the pale of civilization, beyond the reach of religious influence; both have long since been driven from their houses, all traces of one and the other have vanished from the parents. The children, freed from all restraint, roam where they list, the streets become their homes, their school, their church, and their recreation ground, and here they live and dwell as outcasts, awaiting but the chance and opportunity of becoming criminals.

This state of things is not peculiar to Manchester and Salford *alone*. In a greater or lesser degree it exists in every town throughout the kingdom, and the picture here exhibited of our lost and strayed in Manchester and Salford has its counterpart throughout the country.

Here, then, we have the recruiting materials for filling the homes, refuges and birdnests founded by private charity for the rescue of the straying. Truly our contingent is a formidable one and easy of enlistment. The task of the recruiter is an easy one, and the condition and surroundings of those to be enlisted favour and help its accomplishment. Hunger and cold are hard of bearing, homes wherein blows and ill-treatment are the order of the day are the reverse of attractive or attaching. The capture is soon and readily effected. The parents see nothing disadvantageous in the terms proposed; the bargain entails no expenditure, nay, brings in money or relief—the “good-for-nothing” lad is made over to the mutual satisfaction of the contracting parties. There is one waif the less on the streets, it is true, but there is another soul robbed of its faith to swell the ranks of uncertain Protestantism. We have, we think, written enough to show that a very large proportion of our children come within that class which receives the exclusive care and attention of the societies and institutions interested in the reclaiming and educating of its members—also, that the causes which have produced such disastrous results are those which present the greatest facilities to those engaged in the rescue work. So long as these causes are present, and they are never likely to be absent, proselytism will exist and flourish, unless opposed and met by a counter-organization of homes and refuges. It is worth our while to study deeply the existing organization

against which we have to contend. It is wide in its sphere of operations, and it is eminently successful in its mode of carrying them out. We shall come across some strange facts in our researches. These will be useful to us in many ways: (1) in laying open the snares and lairs into which our children, through the neglect or wilful desertion of their parents, often fall; (2) the mode of procedure adopted by many societies in easing religious scruples of the parents; (3) the wonderful influence the societies possess in police-courts, and the great business there carried on by them, and in a word many other *little* hints and disclosures which, if we are not disposed to imitate, we can at least bear in mind as useful indications for any occasion when we may be called upon to act.

In putting before our readers the results of our researches and investigations into proselytising homes and institutions, we intend to be guided by facts. Of these fortunately, there is an abundance at our disposal. They relate chiefly to what has been and is still going on in Manchester and Salford. When we leave these towns we shall be careful to take our authorities with us.

Institutions such as boys' and girls' refuges, like their inmates, have to be fed. This feeding-house exists in the form of a night refuge. Attached to this house is a matron, a secretary, and an officer or two. The duty of this officer is to seize any boy or girl selling newspapers and other vendible articles after seven o'clock at night, to bring to the refuge all waifs and strays sleeping out or wandering about apparently without proper guardianship. They can either be lodged in the night refuge or taken to a neighbouring police-station. If here, they must be brought up next morning on a charge of begging, or under the Industrial School Act. If this latter course is not pursued they are dealt with privately, that is, the parents are seen by the secretary and an arrangement come to. From the refuge they are taken to a central home which has many offshoots. Here they remain, or are drafted away to one or another branch. As to the arrangements with the parents a word must be said. If in the opinion of the committee—three or more of which are sufficient to form a quorum—the parents are unfit guardians of the child, the child is detained in spite of them, or they are won over to sign an agreement which hands over the custody of the child to the detainers, giving them, so the parents are led to believe, absolute power over him, even to the extent of sending him to Canada. A clause is inserted to the effect that should the parent at any time claim the child, he engages himself to pay a total sum, equivalent to five shillings or eight shillings a-week for each week of the child's detention. A stamp is judiciously affixed to this paragraph, which thus becomes a promissory note on signa-

ture by the parent, and which serves as a means of intimidation and menace to him in case he should feel disposed to prove "troublesome."

Neither the central home nor its far-reaching branches are solely dependent on the night refuges for its inmates. The town boasts some twenty-nine ragged schools with a staff of over 600 teachers, male and female. The average weekly attendance is estimated at over 7000. Here a knowledge of the Scriptures is imparted to the children, according to the views and interpretations of the staff. This large attendance is not secured without considerable pressure on the part of the teachers, coupled with a good deal of discreet alms-giving. The children are easily booked, the parents often hold out until some substantial bribe is given them, and this of course is continued as long as the child remains. Among the duties of the staff is that of making themselves acquainted with the families in their district. This they do to perfection. They are assiduous in their attendance upon the sick, and are zealous and active agents in bringing in children to the homes or refuge. Through them the mission women, Bible teachers and readers find entrance into the houses of the sick and dying. The suffering are often removed to hospitals, and during their stay there the benevolent Christian has found a home for their children, who, being in need of a change of air, are removed to Canada in the hopes of finding it there. Let us now make a visit to the police-court. There are, as usual, a large number of children's cases to be got through, some to be referred to the School Board for investigation, others that have been remanded and are "up" for settlement. Near the solicitors' well we notice a respectably dressed female, and not far from her a smart young fellow busy with a note-book. The case of a girl charged with begging is before the Bench. The School Board officer refuses to have anything to do with it. It is not a case for an industrial school; there is some talk of the workhouse; the woman steps forward, a whispered conversation takes place between the magistrate or his clerk and her, a nod of the head, the child leaves the court in the custody of the young woman. The home has found another inmate—a few moments later the case of a boy is disposed of in a similar way. He, too, has gone to be "reclaimed and educated in the fear of God and the knowledge of the Scriptures."

Let us pass from here to the prison, and enter the cell of some wretched man awaiting trial or under sentence of a term of imprisonment. What do we see here? The female Scripture-reader administering spiritual consolation, extracting a confession which may or may not be used against the accused at his approaching trial? She is here for other purposes than

this. He has children, and she must have them. The agreement is once again produced, and the child once more captured.

We have yet another call to make; this time to the hospital. The woman is here again, bending low over the couch of a poor sufferer. There are children in this case, and the woman must have them. The agreement is once more visible, and the sufferer is wearied into signing away the souls which are in quest.

Let us now take a turn among the lodging-houses. We shall find this field a large one and the workers active. They know most of the lodging-house keepers; they know the haunts of the young. They know the resting-place of the tramps—that travelling class of misery and vice. There is work to be done here; new batches have arrived since the last visit was made. Children of young and tender age born on the wayside are to be had here for the asking; they earn nothing, they cost little, but they are troublesome on the road.

We must leave the town and travel to Liverpool. There is a party of children going from Manchester to Canada. A large number of friends and patrons are assembled at the Central Refuge to witness the departure. A breakfast, a prayer, a distribution of Bibles, constitute the programme. Liverpool is reached, and they are marched down to the docks. A large crowd is assembled to see them embark, and ever among this crowd is some anxious father and mother to see if their lost or strayed child is among them. Their search is in vain. The children of "troublesome" parents have left by another route—have gone away with another batch from London or elsewhere.

The little ones going are lively enough. They are generally over fourteen, an age which affords their protectors some legal impunity in the course they are taking. They have all signed a paper declaring their wish to go out; they have all written a letter to the committee asking to go. Have they not read wonderful stories of what has happened to Lizzie Darcy or Johnny Smith and others—how they were adopted, and are now ladies and gentlemen? Have they not seen pictures of "old boys" dressed in furs, with snow-shoes on? Have not the Reports of their Homes contained letters upon letters from those who have gone out, descriptive of the happy lives they are leading, and of the goodness and kindness of all around them? This is their picture of emigration; but there is yet another side to it, and of this side we shall have something more to say before concluding this article.

We have other places yet to visit; amongst others, a soup-kitchen, open all the year round, the recipients of which have to show a ticket of attendance at the Sunday prayer and hymn meetings. Medical missions next attract our attention. Here,

as at the soup-kitchen, temporal relief is afforded to those who suffer, on condition of being present at the religious services—in brief, spiritual medicine first, and bodily medicine after ; in other words, your soul first, and then food and raiment to follow. Here is a Nursery and Home for Widows' Children, open to the children of those who can pay £2 2s. annually, or a lump sum of £10. This cheap and "no inquiries made" system of baby-housing is subject to an agreement in which the following clauses appear :—"In consideration of your receiving into the said Institution, I agree that I will not remove without your consent." The usual clause indemnifying the committee for expenses follows, and then comes : "I also promise and agree to remove the said child at any time if called upon to do so, and I also agree to your finding a home either in England or abroad, as you may think proper."

So much for the Institutions and their mode of procedure. Now to refer to the success attending the efforts made to gain the souls and bodies of our children.

A Board of Inquiry into Proselytism, established in the early part of 1885, brought out the following results:—Institutions visited or inquired into, seventy-five ; Institutions known to be proselytizing, thirty-seven. Lost to the Faith in Manchester and Salford through proselytizing agencies and through the workhouse system, 254 children ; in danger of apostasy through ragged schools, soup-kitchens, City Missions, 573 children ; total for one year, 831.

Much has transpired since that Board met and separated, and the evidence collected by it has been more than confirmed by the fresh disclosures of cases which have come to light since then, and are daily pouring in. The truth is, proselytism surrounds us on every side ; there is not a mission in the two cities which does not furnish victims to its subtle and mysterious influence and organization. It is at once audacious yet crafty, insolent yet craving and hypocritical ; it can be winning and threatening, gentle and swaggering ; all according to the cases it has to deal with. It is ever insensible to rebuke ; invites inquiries and scorns to meet them. It is loud in its professions of non-sectarianism, in its boasts of dispensing charity to members of all creeds and denominations. "No question of creed is ever asked," and other high-sounding advertisements of loftiness of principle, integrity of character, whereby the pence of the poor, the pound of the rich, are gained. It is full of gentleness and Christian mildness on the platform, rich in Scriptural knowledge, and eloquent in its descriptions of the love it bears the little ones. It is hard and domineering in the hovel, profuse in its threats and menaces to those who withhold their children from

it. It seeks not the parent's salvation or reformation ; it wants but the child. For this it is prepared to pay in kind most agreeable to the wants of its guardians. It will pander to them, if needs be ; it is equally ready to bring trouble and annoyance upon them. Their antecedents are known ; the skeleton in the cupboard is no secret to it ; their misfortunes are its gain ; it sets price upon its silence, and that price is the body and soul of their children.

The few following instances of cases which have actually occurred will illustrate the various phases of procedure we have described :—

First, then, as regards the feeding-houses or the night refuge. We will take two cases brought before the Manchester School Board in December of last year by Mr. T. F. Kelly, member of that Board. Two boys, named John Walsh and Charles Campbell, were taken up by the officer of the Refuge for selling newspapers in prohibited hours. The rule adopted by the School Board officer in such cases is, either to restore the children to their parents, summoning them afterwards, or, in case they cannot be traced, to lodge the children in the nearest police-station. This course was not pursued by the officer in question. The children, like many others, were removed to the Refuge [the parents not communicated with until some forty-eight hours after], and then would have been drafted into other homes had not the parents heard of the capture and applied for them.

A later case is that furnished by John and James Kennedy, who were picked up by the Refuge officer and were removed to the Central Home. The first news of the fact reached the grandmother's ears through inquiries she made in the streets among boys wearing the uniform of the Institution. These children were ultimately recovered after legal pressure had been brought to bear upon the detainers.

But yesterday a priest in Manchester brought under our notice a case in which the mother is bewailing the loss of a younger son who had been enticed away from home by an elder brother, inmate of a "working boys' home," which one she knew not. This poor woman is thoroughly respectable and fully able to support her children, and of a character which can bear every investigation. Needless to say that we know where to look for the stolen one.

Such is the mode followed by the "feeders." Let us examine that of the mother-house, or Central Home. Here it is the committee sit, investigate cases, examine applicants, and deal out consolation to the distracted parent. Let us accompany one on her journey thither. Her boy, Joseph McArdle, has been snatched away from her, she knows not why ; she is respectable,

and has a clean and comfortable home. She has heard that he is going to Canada. Her husband is dead, and her boy is now of an age when he might contribute to her support. She calls at the home, asks if what she has heard is true, if she can see him. She is told it is. He has written for permission. The committee have granted it. She *cannot* see him, and he was to sail next day. He was over fourteen; he could do as he willed. She had better go away. Here is another case: a boy, Thomas F——, aged nine, was applied for in November, 1886, by his grandmother, living in C—— Street, Hulme, Manchester. Her application was answered by the following letter:—

DEAR MADAM,—The committee of this Institution cannot at all agree to Thomas F—— going to live with you. Therefore it is quite useless you calling for him on Monday next. Some time in the future Mr. S—— will call and see you on the subject; meantime the matter must rest. The boy is very happy and doing very well, and we cannot run the risk of all we have done being undone.

A case of still more recent occurrence is that heard on December 16, 1886, in the Manchester City Police-court. At the instance of a Mrs. Davidson, a charge was preferred by the Salford Catholic Protection and Rescue Society against one George Raymond, an officer of the Manchester Boys and Girls' Refuge, of stealing her boy, aged seven years. From the evidence it appeared that the mother had at one time signed an agreement handing her child over to the custody of this Society. This agreement she broke by taking the boy away and handing him over to the care of a Mrs. Boyd, a respectable innkeeper. Here the child remained for over two months, the mother refusing to restore the boy to the care of the managers of the Home. That considerable pressure of a harsh and cruel nature had been brought to bear upon the unfortunate woman to induce her to give up the child, the evidence bore witness to. On November 17 the officer entered Mrs. Boyd's house and forcibly took away the child in spite of Mrs. Boyd's protests. For the defence the agreement was produced, and the stipendiary seemed satisfied that its force still held good, and that it was a sufficient answer to the charge. The counsel engaged for the prosecution urged the fact that the agreement was illegal, and therefore void, because the mother had no right to barter her child; but, even supposing it was a valid document, the mother revoked it by taking her boy away and placing him in the charge of Mrs. Boyd. She had, since doing so, acquainted the Society's officer with her determination never to allow the boy to return into their hands. In spite of this they had seized the child.

We have now to make good our charges against the managers of ragged-schools. Certain remarks made by the Right Rev.

Bishop Vaughan in his recent pastoral on "The Loss of our Catholic Children" have been characterized as "cruel and unjust" by a prominent member of the Manchester Ragged School Union. That they were neither cruel nor unjust we will very plainly show. The three following cases are distinctly traceable to the personal interference of a member of Heyrod Street Ragged School, Ancoats, Manchester. They all occurred in streets of the immediate vicinity.

1. Mr. and Mrs. C—— were persuaded by Mr. B——, the gentleman on the staff alluded to, to entrust him with their child Maggie for a short time. They have since repeatedly asked for her custody, and have been refused. Mr. B—— declines to say where the child is.

2. Mrs. D—— had two children taken away by Mr. B——. She believes one is now in Canada; where the other is she knows not. Her applications for the children have been numerous, and all equally fruitless.

3. Another family, Mr. and Mrs. B——, living close to Mrs. D——, have also lost all traces of two children, one of whom was taken away by the aforesaid B—— on the pretext of buying her a pair of clogs. Neither of them have since been recovered.

There are numerous other cases which we could mention as being traceable to the zeal and energy of ragged-school teachers. It has been lately ascertained that no less than 250 of our Catholic children attend regularly in six of the Ragged Schools. The mission they have taken upon themselves is not confined to the imparting of hazy notions of Scripture history to the young, but of winning them over to the vague and misty creed they themselves profess by a systematic course of bribery of parents. This ceases when the child's attendance ceases; it is resumed when the attendances are resumed.

We have alluded to the success attending proselytism in the police-courts. The following letter in reference to a boy, Edward Conroy, from Mr. J. G. Parsons, clerk to the Salford School Board, to the Rev. Fr. Quick, dated February 13, 1885, needs no explanation or comment:—

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—

EDWARD CONROY.

This boy was brought up by the police a few days since for begging, and his case was considered on Friday night by the Industrial School Committee, who decided to recommend his re-committal to St. Joseph's Industrial School. The stipendiary magistrate was, however, opposed to this course, and on Saturday morning discharged the boy, with instructions that he should be taken to the Boys' Refuge, Strange-ways, which was accordingly done. Mr. M—— said that, if from any cause he did not remain, the boy might be brought before him again.

This decision handed over a Catholic boy to a Protestant Home, in which the practice of his religion was denied him, in which he was forced to attend the prayers and services of the Protestant Church.

Another case illustrating the same scene of action, the police-court, is the following:—In this instance we will omit the surname, as the then prisoner is now in America, and is doing well. In August of 1886, Thomas L—— was under remand for assaulting his wife—the second time he had so offended. On the last occasion, if we remember rightly, he had been sentenced to six months. His wife was then in the workhouse with her daughter Maria. It came to the writer's knowledge that the girl had been taken by one of the police-court philanthropists to a Protestant Home. The mother was a Catholic, so was the father. We determined to see the father, if possible, before he was sentenced. We attended court the day his charge was heard, and to our amazement, and probably still more so to his, he was discharged. The prosecutrix was not present in support of the charge. She was on her way to Canada. On questioning the father, we found he was absolutely ignorant of what had been done with the girl Maria, and how the mother had obtained the funds for her journey to Canada. Further inquiries brought to light the fact that "benevolent Christians" had supplied the necessary funds, and that a benevolent court had committed a Catholic child, without the Catholic father's sanction or knowledge, to a Protestant industrial school. This child, we are glad to say, was later on rescued, and safely transferred to a Catholic industrial school.

We have written that these touters for souls are to be found in the prisons. We offer the following facts to prove our statement:—John Robert W—— was in Strangeways Prison in November, 1885. He had a boy in the Protestant Refuge at Strangeways. This son a grandmother was trying to get out. During the incarceration of John Robert W—— he received two or more visits from the managers of this Home, urging him to sign "a paper." This he refused to do, and on his release brought his son out of the Protestant institution.

We have, we think, illustrated the system and mode of procedure with facts which will bear close investigation. We could have extended the list very considerably, but we hope the few we have taken may be sufficient, both in number and in detail, to prove the statements we have made.

Allusion has been made to emigration. It has been shown that the "agreement" contains a clause which gives consent to the child going out of the country. Of the use made of this clause, and of emigration in general, the following statistics,

taken from Paton's "Handy Guide to Emigration" (1886), will furnish some idea:—In London, 996 boys and girls were emigrated in 1885 from eight institutions; in the country, 268 boys and girls from six institutions; and in Scotland, 339 from one institution. A total of 1,603 emigrated in 1885 from fifteen non-Catholic institutions. How many of these children were Catholics? Mr. R. Yates, of Liverpool, secretary to the Catholic Children's Protection Society, in a letter to the writer dated November 5, 1886, does not hesitate to say that, out of 1,040 children emigrated by the Liverpool line of steamers in 1886, it is to be feared that any way half of all that go are Catholics, both because of the poverty of the Catholics, and that religious zeal is a large factor in the work.

Mr. Doyle, in his Report to the Local Government Board on the emigration of pauper children to Canada (1875), speaks thus of the consent obtained from the legal guardians of the children of the "arab" class:—

This, I apprehend, will be found to be done in a very loose and informal way. The precaution is not adopted of requiring the consent of the children themselves to be given before two magistrates, as in the case of pauper children. One girl of about seventeen, whose thoughts seemed to be ever turned homewards, assured me that though she was persuaded by her aunt to come out, yet if she had been brought before two magistrates (as pauper children are) she would have refused. I met with several cases of children sent out as "orphans" who had one, if not both, parents living (p. 7).

Writing of the Homes provided for the children "as places of refuge in any time of trouble or distress," Mr. Doyle writes (p. 17):

The managers of them profess, indeed, to encourage the children to look to the Homes as places of refuge in any time of trouble or distress. I cannot say that I think they have been successful in creating such a feeling of confidence. Over and over again I have been told of the dread of children to go back to the Home, and employers have observed to me that, as a last resource, when all other means have failed, they had to "threaten to send them back to the Home."

The following extract from a lecture on proselytism, given on December 12, 1882, in Glasgow, by the Rev. A. Munroe, D.D., will throw some fresh light upon the trustworthiness of the letters received from the "grateful little ones":—

Six years ago, a woman, who had spent her all in maintaining and nursing her husband, was, on his death, left in utter destitution. She had three children, the eldest of whom was twelve, the youngest nine years of age. Hopeless and helpless, she was induced to give up

the children to Mr. Quarrier. She signed the usual paper, and in due time the children were all sent off to Canada. Often since then did the mother seek to have letters from her children, but for years without avail. Full of remorse for the fatal step she had taken, she tried to get into communication with the children in the hope of somehow being able to recover them. . . . At last, about four months ago, after threatening Mr. Quarrier that she would appeal to the law, . . . a letter was handed to her, and, beginning "My dear Mother," her daughter's Christian name was at the end. . . . It was well written in a lady-like hand, quite grammatical, and full of praise of the country, the people, the homes, and everything in Canada. On being shown the letter, I told the woman that I did not like either its appearance or the tone in which it was written, and instructed her to return to Mr. Quarrier along with her husband (her second) . . . to insist upon getting another letter from her daughter. . . . Another letter came, commencing and ending like the first. But how different were the tone, the expression, and the handwriting! The writer had not seen her brother or sister for over two years, and knew nothing of their place of residence. The letter was written in a very poor hand, and free from that fulsome praise of everything which had excited my suspicions as to the genuineness of the signature in the first. The girl, even in writing to her mother, required to speak with caution. . . . Yet even so, these significant words break out from the full heart of the child, "Oh, mother, I wish I had never come to Canada!"

How many of these letters which yearly embellish the Report sheets of emigration societies are written under circumstances far different from those so glowingly described therein. Here is an extract from one, taken from a Report published this year. The writer, an orphan boy in the third school, who had, at the time of writing, been in Canada barely a twelvemonth, writes :

We had a splendid time of it on board, and plenty of good food. We had some prayer-meetings, and the people came around to hear about God and His works, and how He had put it in your kind heart to take so many fatherless and motherless boys into your home at Hackney, and after a stay there, to fit them up with clothes and food for Canada.

Here is another from an orphan boy :

I have joined the Methodist Church, and by God's grace I intend to do my duty as I ought. I desire a deep interest in your prayers, for there are many temptations lying around my path.

The following sentence seems to read more easily :—"I am drawing wood to the city of Guelph most of my time just now, and it is a pretty cold job sometimes ; it is eight miles from here."

The following is from a boy of thirteen :—

I can drive horses and milk cows. . . . I was glad to read about George Clarke labouring among the Chinese, where Jesus was never heard of before. . . . I am thankful to you for taking me to your Home in H——; when before you took me in, I was starving half the time, but when you took me I had all I could eat and drink, and a good bed to lie on.

In spite of these flourishing Reports of great moral transformations of character, it is an open secret that the Local Government Board are dissatisfied with the voluntary system of emigration as now carried on. They still complain that the inspection is wanting in frequency and efficiency; and if, as it would indeed seem, no improvement has been made in this direction since Mr. Doyle sent in his Report as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, there are good and substantial grounds for complaint.

We have but little space left us to refer to the losses of our children outside the sphere of our immediate experience. A few brief words will, however, suffice to put our readers in possession of evidence sufficient to convince them that the workers in this hateful and abominable traffic are nowhere idle. In Ireland their whole system has lately been vigorously and effectively exposed in the columns of the *Freeman's Journal*. The thirty-seventh Report of the Society for Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics contains abundant proof of the proselytizing spirit of the workers. As is ever the custom, they are busy among the poor; the souls of the rich come not within their scope. There, money is useless and powerless. We learn from this Report that in the seventeen schools in Dublin and Kingstown, there are 493 Catholic children out of a total of 1,203, that their night-schools have 284 of our children, and that the rural schools, twenty-five in number, have 196 out of a total of 727. It is no matter of surprise to us that of their total income—£20,682 for 1885—only £2,407 was raised in Ireland; still less that the large balance comes mainly from England. We do hope, for the honour and good name of our fellow-countrymen, now that they know the use to which these funds are being put, they will endeavour—and they should have little difficulty in succeeding—to find worthier objects for their philanthropy.

To our Irish fellow-Catholics of Dublin we offer our hearty congratulations on the noble and self-sacrificing spirit they have shown in founding the society known as the City Children's Commission, and on the able and zealous way they have set to work to counteract the efforts of the proselytizers. This we can personally testify to, having had the pleasure and advan-

tage of assisting at one of their quarterly meetings, and thus being enabled to gauge the results achieved.

We need only refer to Glasgow to find that the Catholic children of Scotland are in as great danger to their Faith as those of our own cities. "The Orphan Homes of Scotland," comprising some twenty-five buildings—non-inclusive of a City Home, the Working Boys' Home, the Children's Night Refuge; with an average annual income of £16,000, provide accommodation for close upon 1,000 boys and girls. They are under the superintendence of Mr. Quarrier, who emigrated last year 339 children. The Very Rev. Provost Munroe, D.D., in the pamphlet we have already quoted from, mentions that "in the year 1876 Mr. Quarrier gave a soirée in the hall of his home to 420 children. On that occasion clerks or agents noted down the name and age of every child on entering the hall, as declared by the children themselves; of these 420 children, 176 declared themselves to be Roman Catholics." In a letter to the writer dated November 7, 1886, the Very Rev. Provost says:

The proselytizing agencies are still growing in numbers, in energy, and in resources. They conduct their work still on the same lines as before, with this little difference, that occasionally a Catholic parent is told to apply to the priest to take the children, but to return should he not do so. . . . To recruit the Homes, destitute parents present themselves with their children in large numbers. Debauchery, improvidence, drunkenness, and adultery fill them up still more extensively. Then there are many willing agents co-operating, whose zeal is stimulated by the thought that the Homes are rescuing souls from the thralldom of Popery. Among those is the large class of female Bible-readers, missionaries of all the different sects, lady visitors, &c. &c.; these all find frequent opportunities of sending or recommending Catholic waifs to the Homes.

And here we must bring our evidence to a close, and leave our case—the case of the Lost, Strayed, and Stolen of the Poor Catholic Children—to the generous and sympathetic reflection and action of our readers.

We had three main objects in undertaking this article—two of which we hope we have attained—first, that of putting before them the ever-increasing numbers of our Catholic children who have escaped and are daily escaping our care and protection; secondly, the great and fearful success attendant upon the efforts of those who make it their whole and sole business of life to bring under their cruel and horrible influence the little ones we have allowed to drift away from us. For years and years this proselytizing propaganda has flourished, and the waifs and strays of ten and twelve years ago are now the fathers and mothers of children who should belong to us. Their numbers increase daily,

and the waifs and strays of to-day will, in their turn, rear and educate a family in a faith alien and antagonistic to that in which they themselves were baptized.

It would seem that we have grown slothfully callous to this state of things; that we have looked upon it as an evil beyond our powers of checking; that our hands are full, our resources insufficient to grapple with it. Our action for the last ten or twenty years has certainly been in accordance with this opinion. We have waxed eloquent and wrathful at times against the proselytizers, but neither our eloquence nor our wrath has helped to save a single soul from their clutches.

Face it we must, unless we are prepared to be the accomplices of those now waging this hateful war against our children. The cause needs no appeal; the horrid facts should be sufficient to rouse our energies, awaken our sympathies. We have to reproach ourselves with the loss of thousands and thousands of our children, hundreds of whom we could have saved had we possessed an organization capable of concerted action.

Our third and last object is to urge the Catholic body of this country to take this question up, to sift it thoroughly, to put on foot an organization which will be able, in some measure, to check and remedy the evil which is destroying so many of our little ones. No nobler cause exists, none more imperative, than that of helping, protecting, and rescuing the lost, strayed, and stolen of our Catholic poor children, who, ever powerless to help themselves, are left to seek protection, help, and comfort from the hands of those whose motto is, "Your soul first, bread and raiment afterwards."

AUSTIN OATES.

Science Notices.

Ten Years' Progress in Astronomy.—Professor Young, the eminent astronomer, has just delivered a masterly lecture on the above subject before the New York Academy of Science. The record is not a brilliant one, but advance has been made of a solid although slow description. Perhaps the greatest achievement of the decade was the discovery of oxygen in the sun by Dr. Draper, of New York. The researches were most laborious and expensive, and the difficulty was increased by the element exhibiting itself in bright lines on a bright background. It was only natural that astronomers should show some hesitation in accepting an observation which implied much discrimination and a reversal of previously accepted theories. But Dr. Draper has gained the day, and has cleared up the difficulty that had hitherto appeared so anomalous, that the most abundant element of our globe should be unrepresented in the sun.

Mr. Lockyer's studies of the solar spectrum led him to propound his theory that many of the so-called elements in chemistry are not so in point of fact, but are dissociated in the fiery crucible of the sun. He found certain lines in the spectrum common to two or more metals; he was therefore led to conclude that these lines represented the elementary substance which was the *base* of the composition of these metals. He proposed for them the name of *basic lines*. In the meantime, the new diffraction spectrum had been carried to an extraordinary degree of perfection in America, with the result that the *basic lines*, which were supposed to represent an element, are now discovered to be groups of lines lying very closely together.

The corona of the sun has been most carefully studied during the late eclipses, and astronomers seemed to be agreed that it is no optical delusion, no conglomeration of meteorites, but a real solar appendage; an intensely luminous, but excessively attenuated cloud of mingled gas, fog, and dust surrounding the sun, formed and shaped by solar forces. It would appear that the corona is subject to great variations in shape and brilliancy, but we are unable to guess even what can be the cause of such variations.

Much discussion was aroused about the beginning of the decade as to the probable effect of the sun spots maxima and minima on the weather. A large number of observations have been made, especially in Germany, but we are not in a position to assert that any certain relation has yet been discovered. It will be safe to conclude that the solar disturbances exert a faint, but very faint, influence on terrestrial meteorology.

Before leaving the sun, we must refer to Professor Langley's invention of the bolometer, an instrument devised to register degrees of heat hitherto inappreciable. He has founded it on the well-known fact that metals, when heated, lose their power of conducting electricity. In the bolometer, a very fine slip of platinum wire is used,

and the most minute variations in temperature affect the currents of electricity as they pass along the wire, and the galvanometer is quick enough to announce the change. Professor Langley had the incredible energy and skill to transport his instruments to the summit of Mount Whitney, nearly 15,000 feet above the sea, there to pursue his researches in a pure, dry atmosphere, where terrestrial disturbances are reduced to a minimum. He obtained some wonderful results from his new instrument in his investigations into solar heat. Among other things, he has discovered that were the screen of the earth's atmosphere removed, and were we allowed to gaze on the unveiled surface, the colour of the sun would be found to be *blue*.

The honours in astronomy of late years have been taken mostly by Americans. Another great discovery which will make the past decade memorable was that of the two moons or satellites of Mars. This achievement fell to the telescope of Professor Hall, of Washington, and must be reckoned as one of the most brilliant discoveries of the day. The bodies themselves are the faintest specks of light, and can only be picked up by the keenest eyes with long telescopes. They are interesting, however, from more than one point of view. They bring strong confirmation to the very striking theory of Professor C. Darwin on Tidal Evolution.

Ancient Chronologies and Primitive Man.—Among the burning questions of the hour must be ranked the date of the appearance of man upon this planet. Many modern geologists, judging from the position of human remains in the caves and drifts, give primitive man an excessive antiquity. Lyell thinks 100,000 years the very least that can be given, while others maintain 250,000 to be the more likely figure. It is, of course, admitted that the chronologies as given in Genesis are liable to a good deal of uncertainty. The Hebrew and Septuagint differ very considerably in their figures. The Hebrew gives 2,023 years between Adam and the call of Abraham; for the same period the Septuagint has 3,389 years. Among the professed ecclesiastical chronologists there is a great divergence of opinion on this question. The age of the world is given in varying dates from 3,000 to 8,000 years. Beyond the latter figures no important Christian apologist has ventured to go. We cannot give very much weight to the evidence of geology. Geology can tell us of *succession* of different phenomena that have occurred on our globe, but the intervals that may have separated successions it does not and cannot have any means of verifying. The best geologists are ready to admit that to assign dates to any prehistoric fact is mere guesswork.

The Antiquity of Man from Ancient Monuments.—The Abbé Vigouroux, in the *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, has devoted a careful study to the latest discoveries in the ancient monuments of Egypt, Assyria, and India. The early Jesuit missionaries in China were early impressed with the very complete succession of emperors, dating back to the most remote times. They communicated their doubts and fears to their brethren in Europe, and the matter gave rise to some very lively discussion in the 17th and 18th centuries.

The Chinese themselves claim some 2,000,000 years as the age of their empire. It is perfectly easy to show that their own historical monuments will not warrant these figures. The most reliable Sinologists vary somewhat in the estimate of the date of the beginning of Chinese history. Father Martini places it about 3,000 years before Christ; Father Gaubil, 3,500 B.C.; Mr. Legge, about 2,867 B.C. One rather fatal objection to the Chinese documents is, that in the year 213 B.C. Prince Chi-hoang-ti ordered all the historical books to be burned, under pain of death in case of refusal. One thing, however, is certain, that the Chinese lists give no countenance to the extravagant age claimed for primitive man.

Egypt.—The Egyptian chronologies seemed at one time to be full of promise, several lists of the famous thirty dynasties have come down to us, but they are all incomplete. The records tell us the length of reign of each king, but they omit to state whether two kings were associated in the kingdom, or whether they occupied independent thrones. Now, we know from other sources that such arrangements were common enough in Egypt, but the documents give us no indication of such events. They, therefore, become useless for the purposes of exact chronology.

Assyria.—The Assyrians were the only people of antiquity who had an exact method of registering dates. The cuneiform inscriptions that have of late been dug up from the ruins of their cities furnish us with the most exact and precise details of their past history. Their chronology was not reckoned, like that of Egypt and China, by the reigns of the kings, but by the names of certain officials called *kummi*, elected each year, who gave their name to the year, like the consuls of Rome. We have only to regret that so few of these inscriptions have been found, as they throw the most unexpected light, not only upon secular, but also upon sacred history. The most ancient date given is that of the carrying off of an idol in the 2,274th year before our era. A cylinder of Nabonides, king of Babylon, discovered by Mr. Rassam, and now in the British Museum, gives a still more ancient date, if we are prepared to accept it. We read that Naramsin built a temple to the Sun in the 3,750th year before our era. If we admit these figures, the Biblical chronology after the Deluge will be insufficient; for it will place the Deluge, which was perfectly well known to the Babylonians as to the Hebrews, more than 4,000 years before Christ, a date which even the widest margin of the Septuagint will not embrace. The Abbé Vigouroux concludes his exhaustive summary in these words to the savants and historians: "Establish on good grounds the antiquity of man, and the Bible will not contradict you. The Church wishes you to understand that she leaves the question open to discussion, provided you keep within the limits of a sober criticism."

Discovery of Prehistoric Remains.—At the Congress at Namur last August, two young anthropologists, MM. Marcel de Puydt and Lohest, made a communication of an important discovery they had made near Spy, on the Sambre. The scene of their find was the cave of Biche aux Roches. They first came upon a layer of boulder

clay, about four feet in thickness, in which a human skull of recent date was found. The next was a calcareous tufa, about two feet thick, containing numerous remains of *Elephas primigenius* and of *Cervus Canadensis*. Mixed with these were flint implements in abundance, all the work of man. Layer No. 3 contained also remains of the ancient mammals, and was also rich in products of human industry. The great find occurred in layer No. 4, where, about sixteen feet from the entrance of the grotto, lay two human skeletons. They had evidently been buried, for the bones, although crushed by the overlying mass, still preserved their natural position. One of the skeletons is evidently that of an old woman, the other of a young man. The skulls have a close resemblance to the Neanderthal specimen, and show that the very low type indicated by this famous skull was not that of some inferior individual, but represents a race that had already obtained some footing in Europe. The Marquis de Nadaillac thinks that these characteristics do not point to a low type of humanity. We cannot but differ from him. The Neanderthal skull is generally considered the most ape-like cranium yet discovered. It was hoped that this skull might turn out to be an exceptionally misshapen one—that of an idiot in fact. We fear that the present discovery has destroyed these hopes, and will form a subject of rejoicing to the evolutionists.

A NEW MAGAZINE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE.

Political Science Quarterly. Boston: Ginn & Co. Nos. 1 and 2, March and June, 1886.—This new American quarterly, which is edited by the Faculty of Political Science at Columbia College, has certainly made an excellent beginning. The programme of the magazine is to provide a field for the *scientific* discussion of political, economic, and legal questions; and there are the two excellent provisions that every article must be signed, and that every writer who alleges facts not commonly known must cite his evidence. A certain proportion of the articles are on purely American subjects; but even these ought to be welcome to the many English readers who take an interest in the constitution and laws of the great republic. And there is no want of articles of general interest. Thus in the first number Professor Munroe Smith gives an excellent introduction entitled—

The Domain of Political Science.—It is like passing from a London fog into the clear air of New England to read this lucid article, after the confused discussions on "political economy," "the science of statistics," or "comparative jurisprudence," to which we are accustomed at home. And although he does not quite see as yet that politics and economics are merely particular parts of ethics, still he makes a great advance towards that position, and treats with the evil traditions of two centuries when he says: "All the social relations with which politics, law and economics have to do, lie within the domain of ethics. Duty, loyalty, honesty, charity—

these ideas are forces that underlie and support the State; that give to law its most effective sanction; that cross and modify the egoistic struggle for gain" (p. 4).

In the same number there is an interesting and acute article by Dr. De Leon, entitled "The Conference at Berlin on the West African Question," which can be recommended to all students of international law and diplomacy; while in the second number the "Constitutional Crisis in Norway" is shown in all its gravity, and ought to be no matter of indifference to English politicians. But I think the article headed

The Christian Socialists, by Dr. Seligman, will attract most readers in England, for it treats a neglected and interesting chapter in our own social and literary history. It begins by describing the works and failure of the precursor Owen, and the co-operative movement (or rather mania) that culminated in 1830, when there were over 500 co-operative associations and numerous newspapers devoted to the cause. Then we are introduced to the Christian socialistic movement that was called forth by the desperate state of the working classes towards the middle of the century. The two leaders were both clergymen of the Church of England: the elder was Frederick Denison Maurice; the younger, Charles Kingsley. They set to work with a will, and their noble contest against the despotism of a selfish plutocracy and an insolent pseudo-science, styled political economy, that was the apologist of infamies that cannot be written, and miseries that cannot be described—their speeches, agitation, writings, their defence of the Chartists, and their keeping these Chartists back from the use of physical force, the violent abuse heaped upon them by the organs of British respectability, the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh Review*; all this told us in an attractive way by Dr. Seligman, who is full of sympathy for the two heroes and their allies. He does not indeed tell us that the movement collapsed because, while it was essentially a religious movement, it rested on the rotten foundation of false doctrine. The denial of original sin, the disdain of dogma, a "broad and human" conception of religion, which the writer seems to share with Kingsley and Maurice, are fatal errors: there can be no genuine social reform when human nature is so misunderstood, and when man is put first and God second. Still, the article is extremely interesting and instructive; and the excellent plan is adopted of adding at the end the literature of the subject—a list of books, tracts, and articles, extending over four pages.

Let me add that each number of the *Political Science Quarterly* contains short reviews of about six or seven new books; and the reviews, no less than the articles, are signed. In conclusion, though there is no appearance that any Catholic has had any hand in either number of this new quarterly, still, if it keeps true to its programme, it will do us good service by attacking many errors in politics and economics that are still common; for every such error sooner or later does us injury

C. S. DEVAS.

MEETING OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION, 1886.*

THE meeting of the British Association, which took place in Birmingham in the first week of September, was interesting for more than one reason, although many of our prominent men of science were absent. It afforded an opportunity of welcoming scientific visitors from the Colonies, and the choice of Sir William Dawson, one of the most eminent Transatlantic geologists, as president, was a graceful compliment to Canada. Important papers were read in some of the sections, and discussions of no less importance took place in some cases. We will touch upon the principal points deserving of attention.

Sir William Dawson's Inaugural Address is allowed generally to have been a success from a popular point of view, though it has been criticised from a scientific standpoint, as being too loose and popular in its geology. We may remark upon this that, as to the first epithet, criticism of this kind is itself too loose to deal with; and as to the second, that it is a merit and not a defect in a presidential address, as those who remember the elaborate mathematical address of Professor Cayley, a few years ago, scarcely intelligible to the bulk of his audience, will fully testify. Sir William Dawson's address was noteworthy in this respect, that, though he was opening a great scientific meeting, he did not shrink from speaking of God our Creator, and in the peroration of his long and learned essay on the Atlantic Ocean—for such was his subject, and a very appropriate one from a great Canadian—he took the opportunity of comparing the great ocean, in the way in which it cherishes the life of even its smallest inhabitants, to the far greater Being to Whom all things owe their existence. We venture to quote one or two sentences:—

We cannot, I think, consider the topics to which I have referred without perceiving that the history of ocean and continent is an example of progressive design, quite as much as that of living beings. [And again]:—The vastness and the might of ocean, and the manner in which it cherishes the feeblest and most fragile beings, alike speak to us of Him who holds it in the hollow of His hand, and gave it of old its boundaries and its laws; but its teaching ascends to a higher tone, when we consider its origin and history, and the manner in which it has been made to build up continents and mountain-chains, and at the same time to nourish and sustain the teeming life of sea and land.

This last being the closing sentence of the address. The applause with which Sir William Dawson's expressions were received showed that there were many sympathetic minds amongst his audience; but most of our great Agnostic thinkers were not present, whether designedly or accidentally we do not know. The way, too, in which the President spoke of the Darwinian theory of evolution was far different from that in which it has sometimes been treated. Thus:—

* This report, written and in type for the October number, had at the last moment to be omitted, with much other matter. It is now inserted, as retaining its interest.

In entering on such questions, we should proceed with caution and reverence, feeling that we are on holy ground, and that though, like Moses of old, we may be armed with all the learning of our time, we are in the presence of that which, while it burns, is not consumed; of a mystery which neither observation, experiment, nor induction can ever fully solve.

As regards the scientific questions he touches upon, Sir William Dawson is inclined to admit the probability of the opinion now generally held by astronomers, that the interior of the earth, as distinguished from the plastic sub-crust—"its nucleus, as we may call it"—is solid, hard, and dense. He also holds that no change, excepting to a limited extent, has taken place in the position of the earth's axis of rotation; the arrangement of the older rocks around the Arctic basin being the ground of this conclusion.

Then as to the important question of the causes which have produced the vast changes of climate that the Atlantic area and the Continent of Europe have certainly undergone, he inclines to the opinion that they are chiefly, though not entirely, to be attributed to geographical changes. This subject is interesting, as we shall presently see, from its connection with the antiquity of the human race, and we shall again quote a few paragraphs from the address. He says:—

No geological facts are, indeed, at first sight more strange and inexplicable than the changes of climate in the Atlantic area, even in comparatively modern periods. We know that in the early Tertiary perpetual summer reigned as far north as the middle of Greenland, and that in the Pleistocene the Arctic cold advanced until an almost perennial winter prevailed half-way to the equator. It is no wonder that nearly every cause available in the heavens and the earth has been invoked to account for these astounding facts.

It appears that six theories have been put forward on this point besides the one that Sir William Dawson himself favours, of which the most plausible and the most widely accepted is that of Mr. Croll, which attributes the alterations of climate to that movement of the earth's axis which causes the precession of the equinoxes, combined with the greater variations in the eccentricity of the earth's orbit; so that whenever the eccentricity of the orbit is at its maximum, that hemisphere which has its winter in *aphelion* would undergo a glacial period. We may observe, by the way, that no such condition exists at present, for the eccentricity is now comparatively small, and is gradually becoming less and less. Now, Sir William Dawson, while allowing all this as a subordinate cause, is of opinion that it is to that great equatorial current, known to us as the Gulf Stream, that we must look as the main factor of great changes of climate in the North Atlantic and in Europe and North America.

Let us suppose that a subsidence of land in tropical America were to allow the equatorial current to pass through into the Pacific. The effect would at once be to reduce the temperature of Norway and Britain to that of Greenland and Labrador at present, while the latter countries would themselves become colder. Then glaciers would be established on all the mountains of temperate Europe and America; the summer would be kept cold by melting ice and snow. He adds: This would be simply a

return of the glacial age. We may suppose an opposite case. The high plateau of Greenland might subside or be reduced in height, and the openings of Baffin's Bay and the North Atlantic might be closed. At the same time the interior plain of America might be depressed, so that, as we know to have been the case in the Cretaceous period, the warm waters of the Mexican Gulf would circulate as far north as the basins of the present American Lakes. . . . The effects would be to enable a temperate flora to subsist in Greenland, and to bring all the present temperate regions of Europe and America into a condition of subtropical verdure.

Those who wish to become thoroughly acquainted with this subject should read Sir William Dawson's remarks *in extenso*. Further on, we learn something of the wide distribution and notable permanence of "our familiar friend the oyster." These creatures first appear in the carboniferous strata of Belgium and the United States of America; here they are few and small, but they culminate in the Cretaceous age. Sir William Dawson has found fossil oysters in Western Canada, in England, in the Alps, in Egypt, in Judea, on the heights of Lebanon: the species being different, yet very similar. The oyster is merely an example of many forms. These considerations "show that the forms of living things are more stable than the lands and seas in which they live." He seems to think the oyster may be a hard nut for evolutionists to crack—a point upon which we pronounce no opinion.

On the question of the geological permanence of the Atlantic Ocean, he is disposed to think that, as it probably existed in somewhat similar conditions in the very early ages of the earth's history, so it will remain as it is for ages to come; but he says the subject is "too much involved in uncertainty to warrant us in following it further."

Chemical Elements and "Protyle."—Among the addresses of the Presidents of Sections, one that attracted notice from men of science was that of Mr. Crookes in the Chemical Section.

For the most part highly technical, it requires a thorough knowledge of chemistry to follow the thread of its argument properly. But we may briefly say that Mr. Crookes suggests a hypothesis that all the chemical elements, as we now know them, were perhaps evolved from some original primal matter which he calls *protyle* ["from $\pi\rho\omicron$ (earlier than) and $\iota\lambda\eta$ (the stuff of which things are made)"]; he supposes the very beginnings of time, "before the earth was thrown off from the central nucleus of molten fluid, before even the Sun himself had consolidated from the original *protyle*." He imagines "an ultra-gaseous state," "a temperature inconceivably hotter than anything now existing in the visible universe." Then, as the temperature of the cosmic *protyle* was gradually reduced, what we now call elements came into existence, one after another—first hydrogen, or perhaps helium, then other less simple elements. He observes, however, that "this building up, or evolution, is above all things not fortuitous; the variation and development which we recognize in the universe run along certain fixed lines which have been preconceived and foreordained. To the careless and hasty eye

design and evolution seem antagonistic ; the more careful inquirer sees that evolution, steadily proceeding along an ascending scale of excellence, is the strongest argument in favour of a preconceived plan." In another place, he makes this noteworthy remark:—"The epoch of elemental development is decidedly over; and I may observe that, in the opinion of not a few biologists, the epoch of organic development is verging upon its close." This was truly a thought-stirring address, and will doubtless give rise to much discussion hereafter.

Mr. G. Darwin on the Limits of Geological Time.—In the Department of Mathematical and Physical Science, Mr. George Darwin, one of the sons of the celebrated naturalist, occupied the chair, and delivered an address which deserves great consideration. It is an inquiry how far astronomy and physics generally are or are not at variance with geology, as to the date of existence of organic life on the earth's surface. He says:—

Great as have been the advances of geology during the present century, we have no precise knowledge of one of its fundamental units. The scale of time on which we must suppose geological history to be drawn is important, not only for geology itself, but it has an intimate relation with some of the profoundest questions of biology, physics, and cosmogony.

It appears that the late Professor Phillips, judging from the evidence of strata alone, estimated the antiquity of life upon the earth as being possibly between thirty-eight and ninety-six millions of years [a tolerably wide margin]. Mr. Darwin proceeded to discuss the theory of Mr. Croll—to which we have alluded already in our remarks on Sir W. Dawson's address—and after observing that, if true, it would throw a light on geological time, he gave reasons for considering it very doubtful. He then went on to deal with Sir William Thomson's arguments for the limitation of the vast periods of time supposed by certain geologists to have elapsed. As the result of Sir W. Thomson's teaching,

it is now generally believed that we must look for a greater intensity of geologic action in the remote past, and that the duration of the geologic ages, however little we may be able mentally to grasp their greatness, must bear about the same relation to the numbers which were written down in the older treatises on geology, as the life of an ordinary man does to the age of Methusaleh.

And yet Mr. George Darwin is far from agreeing fully with Sir W. Thomson, whom, however, he calls his great master, and of whom he speaks with profound respect. He explains Sir William's three principal arguments for limiting geological time:—First, the gradual retardation of the earth's rotation on its axis by tidal friction, from which it is inferred that the consolidation of the earth took place much more recently than 1000 millions of years ago ; and he gives his reasons for differing from the conclusions sought to be drawn. Secondly, the secular cooling of the earth ; and here, while he admits the great force of Sir William's argument, he states that there are some elements of uncertainty which greatly modify his

acceptance of it. Still less can he follow Professor Tait, who cuts down the limit of time since the cooling of the earth to 10,000,000 years. The third argument, which Mr. Darwin thinks by far the strongest, "depends on the amount of radial energy which can have been given out by the sun," supposed to have been concentrated (in the distant past) from a condition of infinite dispersion. Sir William Thomson has calculated that probably the sun has not illuminated the earth for 100 millions of years—almost certainly not for 500 millions of years; yet even here he shows there is some uncertainty. On the whole, however, he says we are justified in following Sir William Thomson as far as this conclusion, arrived at by him, "the existing state of things on the earth, life on the earth, all geological history, showing continuity of life, must be limited within some such period of past time as 100,000,000 years." We suspect that the figure last cited does not represent Sir William's final and matured opinion; for if it did, few modern geologists would complain of such a limit.

It was a matter of general regret that Sir W. Thomson was not present on this occasion to defend his position. Moreover, we could not help feeling somewhat disappointed that Sir Robert Ball (Astronomer Royal of Ireland), who *was* present, did not use the opportunity of saying a few words in support of his own opinion on one portion of the above-mentioned subject—as stated in his *brochure* entitled "A Glimpse through the Corridors of Time."

There were other Presidential addresses, involving various matters of interest, but our space does not allow us to dwell upon them. There were also important papers read, followed by discussions, in some of the sections.

In the Geological Section it was stated that a flint implement had been found in North Wales (appositely enough in Flintshire) embedded in a stratum evidently deposited before the last glacial period. This was relied upon as indicating the existence of man in Britain at that remote age; 100,000 years are imagined to have elapsed since the termination of the last glacial epoch, but it is to be remembered, in connection with what has already been stated with reference to Mr. Croll's theory, that the date of the glacial periods is involved in considerable doubt, so that, granting all that is alleged with regard to the flint implement, we must still remain uncertain how far it carries us back in point of time.

A paper was read in the Biological Section by Mr. Seebohm, controverting the views lately put forth by Mr. Romanes on the subject of physiological selection, and a discussion ensued. Mr. Romanes himself (as was the case with so many other leading biologists) was absent, and consequently unable to speak for himself. We think we are correct in stating that the general opinion was unfavourable to his theory. An additional weight was perhaps thrown into the scale of adverse opinion by an article from the pen of Mr. Wallace, which had just appeared in the September number of the *Fortnightly Review*. Mr. Wallace, as is well known, was one of the principal founders of the theory of Natural Selection, and

he is not disposed to surrender it even to the limited extent required by Mr. Romanes. One can scarcely help smiling at the style of argument sometimes used in defending the Darwinian theory; one of Mr. Romanes' difficulties is the "inutility of specific characters." Mr. Wallace is disposed to deny the fact, and seems to maintain that all such distinctive characters have some use; Mr. Darwin had allowed that the principle of protective colouring failed in the case of the rabbit, whose upturned white tail is conspicuous both to sportsmen and to beasts of prey. Mr. Wallace, however, replies that the white tail serves as a useful guide for one rabbit (and especially for the young) to follow another in a straight line to the burrow, when alarmed, in the dusk of the evening. On the general question at issue, we shrink from pronouncing an opinion; no one is qualified to do so without having a technical and experimental knowledge of biology. We incline, however, to think that the theory of Natural Selection has had a shake from which it will not recover. We will, however, hazard the following suggestion. If we consider that the idea of spontaneous generation (as it was once called), or abiogenesis, has been now exploded by the experiments of Pasteur and Tyndall, and that it is generally admitted that life never now arises excepting from previously living organisms, it is clear that there was once a time when a different law was in operation, and inorganic matter passed somehow into organic life. If this creative law (so to term it) once in force has now ceased to be so, probably other laws have also ceased to act, and the law which regulated the origin of species and of genera may now no longer exist. A remark (above mentioned) by Mr. Crookes points in this direction. If this be as we have suggested, it is in vain for biologists to attempt to explain by laws *now in operation* all the difficult problems presented by the facts of natural history, many of which carry us back to remote ages.

We should mention that an interesting communication was made to the Mathematical and Physical Section of the Association from the Grenada Eclipse Expedition, announcing that excellent photographs had been taken of the eclipse, and successful experiments made with the spectroscope.

In the non-scientific section of Economics and Statistics, Mr. Impey, the author of "Three Acres and a Cow," read a paper advocating his theory, and stating that it had been successfully reduced to practice, in the course of which he gave details. It should be explained that he does not demand necessarily that the occupier of the three acres should be the *proprietor*; but he does ask for the interference of the legislature to force landlords to *let* the land to occupiers of this class. A paper by Lady Verney, showing the miserable condition of many of the small proprietors on the Continent, especially in France, was read by her husband, Sir Harry Verney—this lady having the good taste to abstain from putting herself forward on the platform to read her paper, as some other ladies do. The Chairman (Mr. Biddulph Martin) remarked, with great judgment, that the matter could not be entirely settled either

by the bright picture drawn of his experiment by Mr. Impey, or by the deplorable state of the peasant proprietors in Auvergne and elsewhere depicted by Lady Verney, to which latter, however, he could bear testimony from his own observation. But we thought an important contribution to the discussion was made by a gentleman present, a landed proprietor, who said he himself had tried the experiment of letting small portions of land, sometimes as much as five acres, and the result had been general failure.

We can see no objection to experiments of this nature being made by those who can afford to make them, and, indeed, we highly approve the attempt; but, on the other hand, we do strongly deprecate anything like compulsory interference on the part of the State.

Other papers were read on co-operative farming and co-operative societies of workmen for manufacturing purposes, some of which are said to have been very successful.

The Association is to hold its meeting next year at Manchester, under the presidency of Sir Henry Roscoe, and we saw with pleasure that the Bishop of Salford is to be one of the vice-presidents.

F. R. W.-P.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

Brazilian Travel.—The interior of Brazil, Mr. Wells* remarks, is less known than the interior of Africa. He has himself in his present work, done much to fill this gap in our knowledge, and his lively pages, with the dainty vignette illustrations that adorn them, make us tolerably familiar with the large section of the country traversed by him. We cannot say that the picture is an attractive one; nor does it give so large a promise of future capabilities of development as might have been looked for in this great intertropical region. Its general features are rolling downs with unproductive soil and sparse vegetation, intersected by heavily timbered river bottoms rendered unhealthy by malarious exhalations. The campos, or open scantily grassed plains, alternate with cerrado, a scrubby bush, which generally covers the crowns of the hills, while the course of the lesser watercourses may be traced in deep clefts on the wide plains and slopes. Agriculture is very backward, and little attempt seems to be made to increase the productiveness of the land. The fazendas, or farm-houses, are wretchedly comfortless structures, with walls that give free admittance to the chill damp of the night air, and roofs equally pervious to the

* "Three Thousand Miles through Brazil." By James W. Wells, F.R.G.S. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1886.

rain. The air of the campos is exhilarating, despite the clinging wet fog of the mornings ; but the river-valleys are hotbeds of fever and ague, the sufferings from which are vividly described by the author. He, with a number of other engineers, was engaged in a railway survey, necessitating the cutting of *picadas*, or straight lines of clearing through the forests, and on some sections a large number of the men died, and nearly all were invalided from the effects of malaria. The insect plagues are numerous and varied, for, in addition to the pricking and stinging tormentors, light skirmishers of the air, there are the far more formidable burrowing species, the sappers and miners of the creeping army, who intrench themselves under the skin, and require to be dislodged by equally scientific methods very unpleasant for the patient.

Social Aspect of Brazil.—A great change in the condition of Brazil has been caused by the transference of all wealth and prosperity from the interior to the coast. The older settlements created by mining industry are dilapidated and deserted ; some towns, like Villa Rica, in Parana, once wealthy, as its name implies, are as ruinous as the prehistoric cities of Central America, and the massive fazenda buildings of the early colonists are abandoned to decay. The seaboard, including a belt of from 50 to 400 miles inland, produces, with the Valley of the Amazons, nearly all the exports of Brazil. Here foreign capital and immigration have vivified the country, while in the inland regions the few and scattered inhabitants live in a state of absolute apathy. To lie in a hammock, and drink *cachaça* (the native spirit) all day are their luxuries, active pursuits being undertaken only under pressure of necessity. The absence of a market for produce discourages agriculture, and the universal infusion of negro or Indian blood has enervated the European stock. The most flourishing industry is the cotton manufacture, and the sixty factories established during the last few years are all prosperous, causing a diminution of 8 per cent. in the imports and an increase of 10½ in the exports.

Asiatic Trade through Canada.—The *Times* of October 21 gives extracts from the *Montreal Herald* of October 8 showing how the Canadian Pacific Railway bids fair to monopolize the Chinese tea-trade with America. The pioneer vessel of this route had already delivered her cargo, and the latter had been distributed to the various points of supply, reaching Montreal and New York in forty-seven and forty-nine days respectively. The cars laden with tea for the United States are detached at the several junctions along the line and forwarded to their destination without breaking bulk. When the company's new steamers are running, the voyage between Vancouver and Yokohama will be made in twelve or thirteen days, a great saving of time over the present voyages between San Francisco and Japan. Four other tea-laden vessels were to follow, carrying an aggregate of 100,000 packages, valued at two million dollars. Mr. Frazar, whose firm has been established for twenty-seven years in China and Japan, considers the prospects of a rapid development of the Asiatic trade over the Canadian Pacific line as very hopeful, and speaks favourably of the dock and wharfage accommodation at Vancouver.

In addition to the tea-trade there is a large import of raw silk from Japan to the Eastern States, amounting to from 15,000 to 18,000 bales, valued at some ten millions of dollars. This trade, representing a freight charge of two million dollars, and steadily increasing, now comes by the Pacific Mail, and Occidental and Oriental Steamship Company, but a considerable portion of it may be expected to be diverted to the Canadian Pacific in consequence of the greater rapidity of transit. A large proportion of the passenger traffic between Europe and the East will also, it is anticipated, prefer the Western route in order to escape the heat of the Red Sea and Suez Canal.

A French Traveller in Merv.—M. Gabriel Bonvalot, in a letter written from Samarcand to the *Journal des Débats*, describes his experiences in a recent visit to Merv. He made his way from India to Afghanistan without official permission, and thence onward to the great oasis of the Steppe. The town, hidden at first behind a screen of trees, presented a lively scene of animation after the stillness of the desert, as carriages as well as horse and foot passengers were moving about in all directions amid clouds of dust, and a number of workmen were employed in building a brick wall to surround the city.

The newly built Russian quarter had suffered from an inundation last May, whose effects were still visible in July in sheets of stagnant water surrounding the place, and in the general marshiness of the ground. The Russians had persisted in building on the left bank, despite the warnings of the natives and of Jew and Armenian residents; consequently, when the Murghab rose, all the newly erected buildings were swept away for a distance of 100 feet from its bed, while the right bank, being higher, escaped injury.

The new town consists of two parallel streets running east and west, the building of the southern street having been interrupted by the flood. The houses, built of brick, are generally only one story high; but larger dwellings are being erected to the west of the town. The population had risen to about 3,000, composed of Russian officers and *employés*, Armenian merchants, and workmen of various nationalities attracted by the railway.

The writer was present when the line from Kizil Arvat was opened on July 15 last, 557 kilomètres of railway having been constructed in thirteen months, in spite of the want of water, the sands, the torrid heat, the glacial cold, and the inundation of the Murghab, which delayed the works for a month.—*Times*, November 3, 1886.

The Gate of the Caucasus.—The *Moscow Gazette*, in an article on the city and port of Batoum, describes the sensation created some months ago by the announcement of its abolition as a free port by the Czar. Its growth since it acquired that status in 1878 has been immense, although the Turkish inhabitants then migrated *en masse* to Trebizond, leaving only a population of 3,000, since increased to 10,000. The Russian element is only a small minority, the Greeks preponderating, and the Armenians forming also a considerable section of the inhabitants. Batoum, from being a purely Asiatic town, has become *quasi-European*; and the central meeting-place for transacting

business is a café facing the sea, where none but Turkish affairs are discussed, where Turkish coffee is the only beverage drunk, and Turkish tobacco alone is smoked. The future of Batoum is assured both by the excellence of its harbour and the superiority of its geographical position. It is the best port of the Black Sea; it has a depth of water close to the shore of from 30 to 50 fathoms, and its anchorage would accommodate fifteen war-vessels, in addition to an indefinite number of merchantmen. It forms the outlet of a railway 800 versts in length, connecting two seas, and transporting goods, not only from Baku and Tiflis, but also from the Trans-Caspian territory. The Krasnovodsk-Merv Railway will supply it with large quantities of silk for transportation, and it already carries Persian wheat and Baku petroleum. A canal from the latter town is spoken of, and it is thought that the whole trade of the decaying town of Poti will pass to Batoum, which will offer greater inducements to settlers when its marshes have been drained.—*Times*, November 10, 1886.

The French Colonies.—In *La France Coloniale* much statistical information as to the French colonies and protectorates has recently been given by M. A. Rambaud. Their total area, including the protectorates of Tunis, Cambodia, Annam, Tonquin, Madagascar, and the Congo, is 1,900,000 square miles, or nearly six times that of France itself. The total population is about 28½ millions, including that of the Congo, for which there are no returns.

The trade with all the French colonies, exclusive of Algeria and Tunis, is estimated for the year 1883 at £19,200,000, which, with the addition of £16,000,000 for the former and £1,800,000 for the latter, gives a total of £37,000,000—about a tenth of the total trade of France. Of this total colonial trade about £22,000,000 is with the mother country—a larger trade than is done by France with any single country except England (£60,000,000), Belgium (£38,520,000), Germany (£31,480,000), and the United States (£28,120,000). Small as is the trade of the French colonies compared with that of the British, it is progressively increasing, that of Algeria, which in 1840 was but £900,000, having reached £16,000,000; and that of Senegal, in 1823 but £100,000, having by the latest statistics exceeded £1,300,000. The trade of Martinique has within forty years doubled its previous figure of £1,200,000, and that of the islands of St. Pierre and Miguelon has risen from £320,000 to £1,200,000, between 1858 and 1884. Out of 1,315,144 tons of shipping which entered and left the ports of these colonies in 1883, 1,235,392 tons, or over 95 per cent., were French.—*Times*, November 19, 1886.

Father Damien and the Lepers.—The latest news from Molokai is contained in *Les Missions Catholiques* of November 12, 1886, which publishes the following letter from Father Columban Beissel, written from the Sandwich Islands on the 29th of September previous:—

“Since my first visit to Molokai I have returned there almost every two months. Father Damien Devenster’s health was then gravely attacked, and at each succeeding visit I noted fresh symptoms, and an

aggravation of the disease. The father, however, was not cast down. 'I am satisfied,' he declared to me, with admirable resignation, 'there is no longer any doubt as to my condition. I am a leper.'

"But on Monday, September 27, the time of my last visit, I found a great change. The patient, who had for two months been practising the treatment of a Japanese doctor, was sensibly better. He had ceased to suffer, appetite had returned, and sleep with it, and he was strong enough to visit his leper hospitals either on foot or on horseback.

"Another boon vouchsafed us by Providence! A young American has come to his assistance. He is a layman converted from Anglicanism, who, on the news of Father Damien's illness, resolved, in order to serve God, to consecrate his care and devotion to the missionary father and his sufferers."

The enthusiasm created, even amongst Protestants, by the self-immolation of this heroic priest is so great that an English clergyman has started a subscription as a testimonial to him, and a considerable sum has already been collected.

A New Port on the Mediterranean.—The French are about to develop the natural capabilities of Tunis by opening up the Lake of Bizerta, thirty miles distant from the city of Tunis, which may at a small outlay be made one of the largest harbours in the world. An area of 50 square miles of anchorage for the largest ships is here connected with the sea by a river five miles long, with a width of a mile, and a central depth of 4 to 6 fathoms. A little dredging at a few points of this channel is all that is required to make the anchorage available. Consul-General Playfair, in his report for the year 1885, after describing all the natural advantages of this "Tunisian Venice," gives the following picture of its scenery:—

The western bank is rather low, and covered to the water's edge with olive trees. The opposite shore slopes gradually up to a height of 200 feet in some places; it is well wooded and quite park-like in its appearance. It would form a splendid suburb for a great city, such as will, in all probability, be built here some day. The view from it, both of the salt and fresh water lakes, bounded in the distance by the remarkable mountain of Djebel Ishkul, suggested to my mind the Lake of Lucerne and the Bernese Oberland on a small scale.

Its strategical advantages are described in a letter of Admiral Spratt's, published in the *Times* of May 16, 1881:—

I fully confirm the fact of the Lake of Bizerta being easily made available for all the fleets of the world, or for any of them, and at a small cost, for I would risk my reputation on its being effected for less than a quarter of a million. All that is necessary is an excavation of about a quarter of a mile through the narrow strip of alluvial plain that separates the lake from the Bay of Bizerta, and some dredging for about the same length on each side of this narrow strip, so as to connect the deep water within the lake with the bay outside, and thus open it to the Mediterranean, by which means the largest ships of any navy and the fleets of the world could find accommodation and security within Bizerta Lake; and it would thus become the finest and most commodious harbour

in the Mediterranean. Situated as it is, at the threshold of the central strait of the Mediterranean, if possessed by France or by Italy it would become the most important strategic naval port within it, and completely command the communications between the eastern and western divisions. France, which now in Toulon is 400 miles distant upon one flank of that line, would thus be only four hours' steaming from it on the other flank, where not only could she have another naval arsenal, but a spacious and perfectly enclosed basin for the secret practice of torpedo fleets, gunnery exercise, and even some manœuvring with a few ships, and all in what would become a secret port.

New Afghan Boundary.—Captain Yate, in a recent letter to the *Pioneer* newspaper, points out that the new frontier secures to Russia a route of about 185 miles from Penjdeh to the Oxus, along a connected line of wells divided into ten stages. The road is passable throughout for camels, and specially adapted for them, as they require no grain, and there is plenty of grazing for them everywhere. Thus communication is easy and practicable across what was recently supposed to be sheer desert, connecting the two principal lines of Russian advance—that from the Caspian with that from Turkestan. The Boundary Commission have delimited and marked by pillars about 325 out of 350 miles of frontier, the only point left undecided being the actual spot where it shall strike the Oxus. When this question shall have been settled between the two Governments, the erection of pillars across the intervening tract of twenty-five or thirty miles will be easily accomplished. The Commission has, moreover, collected a great amount of valuable information about practically unknown regions likely to be of great use in any future operations in Afghanistan.—*Athenæum*, November 27, 1886.

A Japanese Volcano.—The *Times* of October 27 contains an interesting letter from a correspondent, describing Mount Asamayama, the largest of the fifty-one active volcanoes of Japan, in whose heart, in native parlance, "a fire is always burning." Some twenty eruptions, the last, a trifling one, in 1870, have been recorded during a period of twelve centuries, but the most noteworthy began on June 25, 1783, reaching its climax only in the August following:—

In Tokio, eighty miles away, fine ashes fell to a depth of two inches. Whole valleys were filled with ejectamenta, rivers diverted, and villages, to the number of fifty-eight, buried or burnt; and pitchy darkness even at noonday, with lightning and frightful thunder, prevailed in the leeward districts, so that in places as many as forty miles distant "night and day were equally dark, and no one knew when it was daybreak." Sudden and terrible death came to hundreds of the peasantry, and upon the ruined survivors came soon afterwards the further horrors of starvation and riot. On the north side of the mountain a prodigious lava-stream descended for a distance of thirty-eight miles, the first thirty of which were accomplished in sixteen hours. Throes of earthquake constantly shook the land. Flights of huge stones, some of them from fifty feet to more than a hundred feet in diameter, were shot into the air and "dropped as abundantly as the leaves of trees." In Tokio, besides great darkness, there were great shaking and roaring, both of which were also experienced in provinces as much as 180 miles away.

This was the last of these great catastrophes, but the still steaming crater, and the old lava-stream, like "a huge black serpent" on the face of the mountain, serve to remind the spectator of its latent capabilities. The present crater, situated at a height of 8,500 feet above the sea, yawns to an unknown depth, with nearly vertical walls. Its aspect is thus described:—

The churning and groaning far below, the masses of fetid vapour ever being hurled up wrathfully from the gloomy and awful depths, and the riven, scorched, and honeycombed walls, exhaling clouds of suffocating steam from a thousand crevices and holes, readily suggest latent possibilities well calculated to appal the stoutest heart. Apparently the present crater is the youngest and innermost of three. Further down, on the south-west side, are to be seen, along with numerous fissures of unfathomable depth, remains which point to the existence of two former craters, concentric and of large dimensions, and separated from one another by a considerable interval. Possibly the existing cone may have been formed during the great eruption of 1783.

The Panama Canal.—The report of an engineer who recently visited the Isthmus of Panama is summed up in the journal of the Manchester Geographical Society for the second quarter of 1886. According to this account no trace of the excavations supposed to have been made for the Canal are visible for half the distance between Colon and Panama. Along the line he saw instead many overturned and rust-covered carriages, some of which were embedded in the soil, while quantities of rolling stock not yet put together were lying about in a state of ruin, owing to long exposure to wind, weather, and marsh-damp.

At Matachin, where it was supposed that the construction of the Canal was being pushed on with all speed, nothing was to be seen but abandoned excavations and upturned steam engines, the latter being apparently very common objects in the Isthmus. In a neighbouring jungle he found straight rows of saplings, three or four yards deep, extending for a length of 160 yards. On closer inspection he found that this symmetrical plantation had grown out of waggons filled with earth which had been left there a couple of years ago. The story is rather taller than the saplings, but it is put forward with an air of perfect seriousness. The aggregate plant of the company has cost eight millions sterling. Three fourths of it is said to be unfit for use, owing to the carelessness with which complicated machinery is left out in the open air, or at best packed up in skeleton cases. Of the twenty-one sections into which the future waterway has been divided, only five are in anything like an advanced condition. In three the ground has merely been scratched, and in thirteen it has been left alone altogether. He does not think much of the project to choke up the Chagres by means of a gigantic dam. He saw the river rise twelve metres in one night, and carry down quantities of soil held together by the roots of tropical plants, more than sufficient to fill up the proposed reservoir. On M. de Lesseps' own showing, his difficulties at this moment are very serious, apart altogether from his financial embarrassments. As an advocate of level canals he has always declared that no maritime canal depending on inland waters can be a success. In spite of that he cannot quite make up his mind whether the canal is to be taken right across the Isthmus at one uniform

level, or whether the rising ground of the Cordilleras is to be surmounted by locks. If the difficulty of the inland water supply could be got over, it would be much cheaper to make the Canal with locks rather than to cut it through on one level, but it would be far more expensive to work, and the delays would be endless. If enough money is not forthcoming to make the waterway according to the original plans, it is possible that a canal with locks may be resorted to; but if this prove to be the case it will be a considerable defeat for M. de Lesseps and a great misfortune to his shareholders.

In some of M. de Lesseps' most recent utterances about the Canal, he declared that it would be open, as originally announced, in 1889, and that it would not matter if the most difficult part of the work still remained to be done, as the prestige secured by the opening would attract fresh capital. From this remarkable pronouncement it may be inferred that an attempt will be made to push on the works through the marshes at both ends in order to have a sham inauguration of the unfinished waterway at the time originally named.

The Plague of Yunnan.—*Les Missions Catholiques* of November 19 and 26 contains an interesting account of the singular epidemic which has at intervals ravaged the Chinese province of Yunnan since the suppression of the Mohammedan rebellion in 1873. The most singular feature of this illness is that it first attacks the rats, who die in myriads before the human victims are assailed by it, and it is hence called the "disease of the rats." Its most distinctive peculiarity is the appearance of a small tumour, at first no larger than a pea, and increasing to that of a pigeon's egg, in some of the articulations of the body, such as the arm-pit or elbow joint. This fatal symptom is attended by no local pain, but is followed by violent fever, which carries off the patient very often in twenty-four hours. Families have been carried off in a few hours and whole villages depopulated by this scourge, which appears to be highly contagious. It would seem to be confined to the lowlands, and people may escape it by taking refuge on the heights, if they can avoid ever descending thence during its continuance. After many remedies had been tried in vain, some one, it is not known who, thought of administering ipecacuanha, which was quickly adopted by the missionaries, and is now extensively used, with very good results, in doses of from one to two grammes, repeated at intervals. Other emetics have been tried as a substitute, but without success. The plague no doubt originated in the frightful mortality of the civil war, the poison of the corrupting bodies being transmitted or disseminated by the rats.

Volcanic Eruption in the Pacific.—A letter in the *Fiji Times* gave the first news of an appalling volcanic outburst in the island of Ninfu, one of the Tonga group. The eruption, which occurred at the end of August 1886, was preceded by violent earthquakes and storms of thunder and lightning. The inhabitants, alarmed by these premonitory symptoms, left the six other villages to congregate in Futoo, a town on the leeward or western side of the island. From the 30th to the 31st of August violent shocks and earth-tremors were incessant, until, on the latter date, the subterranean fires burst through the earth-crust

on the shores of the lake, and a column of flame, visible at Keppel Island, 100 miles distant, shot up 2,000 feet into the air. For ten days the eruption continued, with varying degrees of violence, the earthquake shocks scarcely ever intermitting for an hour. The natives on the arrival of a ship were found huddled together at one end of the island, much terrified but uninjured. Provisions were left to them, but, as there seemed to be no further immediate danger, it was judged better not to remove them. This was perhaps an outlet of the great earthquake wave which shook the Southern States of America.—*Times*, December 2.

Trade of the Corea.—No. 61 of the annual series of Foreign Office Reports contains a report by Consul-General Baber on the trade and the commerce of the Corea for 1885. Although the figures are still very small, imports and exports together amounting only to £382,000, this figure shows an advance on that for the previous year. This increase Mr. Baber attributes to the consumption of Manchester goods, used, he says, by 6,000,000 out of the 8,000,000 inhabitants, the heavier classes alone being in demand, and sized goods being unsaleable.

The resources of the country are (he goes on) considerable, and with peace and good government Corea ought to afford an important outlet for British piece goods. These now hold the market, but so far English merchants have avoided entering the country, being content to allow Japanese to act for them and control the trade. One German firm has established a house at Chemulpo, and secured several government contracts; the agents of the American Trading Company have also visited the country, and met with so much encouragement, that they now propose to open an office in the capital. Several British merchants have prospected the country, but they retired after incurring heavy losses. Chinese, mostly from Chefoo, carry on a small barter-trade; nine-tenths of the shipping and of the import and export business is in Japanese hands, but of the goods imported, nearly two-thirds are of British origin and manufacture. In view of the revolutions and continuous political scares, the annual epidemics of cholera and relapsing fever, and, not least, the inexperience and vacillation of the native officials, it does not seem probable that any British mercantile firm of repute is likely to be established for some time to come in any of the three treaty ports."

Massacre in the Louisiade Archipelago.—The *Melbourne Argus* of November 1st has the following telegram from Cooktown:—"The missionary schooner *Ellangowan*, which arrived during Saturday night, brings the information that Thomas Mullens reported at Fort Moresby that while he was at Renard Island the natives told him of the murder of Captain Craig and all the crew of the brig *Emily* of Cooktown. Captain Craig was pearl fishing off Johannet Island, near Gordon, a village in the Louisiade Archipelago. There were working with him Walter Hollingsworth, an assistant named Thompson, a Greek, a Malay, a cook, four Malay hands, and he also employed seven Johannet Islanders. On September 14th, a boat belonging to the *Emily* went out to the shelling-grounds, and the cook, with three islanders, who pretended to be sick, was left aboard. The boat anchored, and Craig and Thompson were in the act of raising the

diver, when the natives capsized them overboard, cutting the diver's life-line. The Greek was clubbed with a piece of firewood, and the Malays jumped overboard, and swam for the reef close by. The islanders in the boat returned to the brig, got a rifle, and shot the men as they were still swimming for the reef. Meantime the cook had been killed by the natives left aboard the brig. The natives plundered the brig, spread the sails about, poured kerosene over them, and set fire to the vessel, which sank in nineteen fathoms. On hearing the account of the natives, Mullens crossed over to Johanneet Island, the natives of which, who were previously friendly, were afraid to communicate with him. By the threat of bringing a man-of-war, he compelled them to restore the *Emily's* boat, and warned another ship's crew to be on their guard. Both Craig and Hollingsworth leave wives and families at Cooktown.—*Times*, December 8, 1886.

Notes on Novels.

The Princess Casamassima. By HENRY JAMES. London :
Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THE irrepressible Socialist threatens to be as great a bore in fiction as in politics, and the subscribers to circulating libraries will soon have as much cause to anathematize his existence as Home Secretaries and inspectors of police. That it is utterly impossible to clothe this obtrusive personage with any degree of romantic interest we will not absolutely aver ; we can only maintain that in the hands of any novelist who has yet treated him, he appears as an unmitigated and unconscionable nuisance. The reader in search of entertainment may generally make it a rule to skip every page in which he figures, and this recipe would reduce the fraction of Mr. James' work to be gone through to infinitesimal proportions. The *Princess Casamassima*, who gives its title to the book, is a fantastic foreign woman, separated from her husband, who seeks a stimulus for her jaded emotions in the companionship of socialists and conspirators. The story is principally concerned with the fate of one of the more innocent and helpless of these, Hyacinth Robinson, the son of a convicted murderer, whose fate would have a touch of tragic pathos were it not that he has deliberately brought it upon himself by volunteering for the rôle of assassin as the agent of a secret society. Ladies of rank who haunt the quarters of the poor under plea of charity, but really with the design of marrying revolutionary artisans, had better be left in the gutter which they seek by preference, and though perhaps intended as types of a certain phase of English society, are at best a broad

caricature of it. Mr. James, whose vaguely suggestive style places him at the head of the impressionist school of fiction, is out of his element among the social deeps where he has here sought his subject.

The Old Order Changes. By W. H. MALLOCK. London :
Richard Bentley & Son. 1886.

MR. MALLOCK cannot write otherwise than brilliantly, and his present work is quite sufficiently full of smart sayings to justify his reputation. His brilliancy is, however, rather that of the essayist than of the novelist; and the readers of fiction pure and simple will find lengthy disquisitions on socialism, radicalism, and all the other *isms* allied thereto, somewhat heavy pabulum. Of course the principal characters are theologically-minded persons, with a due taste for airing their various views and opinions; and equally, of course, the hero belongs to the modern type of half-hearted waverers, halting between two loves and more than one religion. Many eminent personages figure here under more or less transparent disguises, and we fancy the author has transgressed the bounds of good feeling and literary courtesy in his malignant presentation of a prominent statesman under the alias of Mr. Snapper. The change in the attitude of the Conservative party towards the Liberal leaders since "The Old Order Changes" first began to appear in the pages of the "National Review" makes this breach of taste all the more conspicuous; and if we mistake not, it will now grate on many readers who were previously ready to condone, if not to applaud, it. Catholics, at least, have always reason to feel grateful to Mr. Mallock for the sympathy with which he writes of their religion; and the argumentative hero of the book, who triumphs over all opponents in the fields of politics and religion, is a Catholic priest, to one of whose sermons thirty-four pages of letterpress are devoted. The descriptions of Riviera scenery and chateau life among the Maritime Alps have all the glamour of the South, and lend grace and poetry to the action placed among them.

A Modern Telemachus. By CHARLOTTE M. YONGE. Two vols.
London : Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THIS is a tale of the beginning of last century, relating the adventures of a noble French family among the Algerine corsairs. We are told that it is founded on fact; and Miss Yonge confesses that her authority (as she found out after the tale was written) had suppressed several touching catholic features in the narrative. There is a little French lady very charming in her romance and heroism; her head is full of "Télémaque," and in the most perilous moments she cannot help seeing wonderful coincidences; whilst her serene readiness for martyrdom is really touching. There is also, as a sort of foil to the little catholic girl, a young Scot, Arthur Maxwell Hope,

lanky and noble, who supplies the necessary "dear-old-Church-of-England" element without which Miss Yonge's tales would not be themselves. There is a comic Irish servant, whose dialect is decidedly stagey; an Arab merchant, who turns out to be a Scotchman; an old steward, a great French lady, and plenty of Turks, Arabs, and Moors of varying degrees of savageness. The incidents comprise the capture of the party by the corsairs, their adventures in captivity, the death of some, and the final release of others. The story is sufficiently interesting, and the characters are endowed with that modified or transfigured vitality which does duty in Miss Yonge for real flesh and blood. She is rather obtuse in her ideas on some catholic matters. French children did not say their prayers exclusively in Latin at the date of the story; nor have they done so at any other time. The tale would have been exquisite if its catholic tone had been sympathetically preserved; but its starched and prim Anglicanism spoils it.

Lady Branksmere. By the Author of "Molly Bawn." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1886.

IT seems to us that the author of "Molly Bawn," has mistaken her vocation in abandoning her native vein of light comedy for the pseudo-tragedy of the modern disciples of Mrs. Radcliff. The domesticated Cupid of the croquet lawn, not the sombre Eros of the mystery haunted mansion, is her true inspiring genius; the butterfly dalliance of the covert-side and the county ball, her fitting subject rather than the gruesome fatalities of jealousy and crime. Her would-be sublime consequently borders on the ridiculous, and her melodramatic machinery suggests pantomime, instead of tragedy. Her heroine's wicked perversity is not even lifted to the dignity of passion, and the story of her married life is only saved from being absolutely bad by being utterly unreal. The climax of absurdity is reached when she goes to her husband to announce to him her intention of leaving his house with his rival, and when he, after escorting her to the rendezvous, first knocks down, and then buys off the intending Lothario. The story has an evil genius in the shape of a beautiful and unscrupulous foreigner, and a pretext for domestic misery is supplied by her unexplained position as the keeper of a lovely maniac; while these tragic complications of Lady Branksmere's otherwise enviable lot are relieved by the juvenile flirtations and school-room and nursery amenities of her numerous brothers and sisters,

A Northern Lily. By JOANNA HARRISON. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THIS novel, which professes on its title-page to be the record of "Five Years of an Uneventful Life," is in striking contrast with most of its fellows. Instead of the hurry of incidents artificially strung together in defiance of all laws of probability, we have a calm

and restful flow of narrative, developing itself without effort or exaggeration. Elsie Ross, the daughter of a Scotch laird, the "Northern Lily," who gives its name to the book, is in her unpretending sweetness and simplicity an unusually lovable heroine, and we follow her with unflagging interest through all the phases of her life. The sweet Scotch lassie, parted from her home by her father's second marriage, becomes the stay and comfort of two English households in succession, and is received in one as its future daughter-in-law. When her life is blighted by the death of her young lover in Afghanistan, she still remains to solace the bereaved mother, until, summoned home by her stepmother's selfishness, she falls a victim to her sense of duty in attending her little brothers in an infectious illness. This is a brief outline of the story, which derives such grace from the telling, and such interest from the graphic studies of character and scenery with which it abounds, that we willingly forego the more involved sequence of events that generally go to the composition of the three-volume novel.

Neæra: a Tale of Ancient Rome. By JOHN W. GRAHAM. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THE difficulty of reconstructing for us a picture of classical society, as the basis of a love-story calculated to interest the modern reader, has been skilfully surmounted in these pages. The most characteristic types of the early empire, the suburban rowdy, the luxurious patrician, the vulgar parvenu, the supple courtier, are interwoven with the fate and fortunes of Julius Martialis, the gallant centurion of the Pretorian Guard, and his apparently low-born bride Neæra, ostensibly the daughter of Masthion, the potter of Sorrento, but really the stolen heiress of an illustrious senator. The fiction is laid in the later years of Tiberius, and the action takes place by turns in Rome, Sorrento, and the island-paradise of the sombre solitary of Capri. The tyrant himself, the most sinister of the Cæsars, is portrayed at the age of threescore and ten in the following striking passage:—

His tall form had contracted a stoop, and was shrunk almost to emaciation. His head was bald, except some thin locks which flowed low down upon his neck. Thus far might honest age be accountable; but to see the offensive ulcerous eruptions stuck over with plaster which blotched his pale face, was to awaken suspicion of polluted habits. Yet from the midst of his unattractive physiognomy there shone the undimmed brilliance of his large eyes. Their beauty had outlived the once acknowledged comeliness of his face, as well as the athletic proportions of his large frame. Somewhat heavy-lidded and slow-moving, their glance, nevertheless, when it became fixed, seemed to pierce the inmost thoughts of him they rested upon. Their depths were as fathomless as the ocean, save when lit with a sudden magnetic flash of wrath, which his minions ever watched for in trembling. Nothing throughout the entire empire received such unvarying cat-like watch and ward as those basilisk orbs which gathered more than they emitted.

To Capri, that island-mountain seemingly poised between two firmaments, which its gloomy master had then studded with his crag-built palaces, the principal characters are led by diverse motives, and here the *dénouement* of their story takes place. Hither comes the Pretorian officer in the discharge of his duty, and hither, to have her unrequited passion spurned by the true-hearted soldier, Plautia, the gorgeous Roman beauty, follows him in all the opulence of her wealth and charms. There Masthion the potter meets his fate, a victim of the tyrant's cruelty; and there Neëra, forcibly brought at first by his capricious command as a prisoner, is eventually reinstated in her rank, and reunited to her lover, who is restored to the favour, after having defied and incurred the wrath of his imperial master. The story is not overloaded with archæological detail, which is properly subordinated to its dramatic interest. The attachment of the lovers alone strikes a certain note of discord, being, perhaps inevitably, too modern in sentiment for its classical surroundings. Among the best of the historically descriptive passages are the glowing scene of the last banquet of Apicius, with its tragical conclusion, and the sketch of the palace-prison of Tiberius, with its fence of sheer sea-cliffs a thousand feet in height.

Sir Percival. A story of the Past and of the Present. By J. H. SHORTHOUSE. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

MR. SHORTHOUSE'S new story will not excite the same interest as "John Inglesant." It is weak, with the same kind of weakness which marked the concluding third of the former romance. Its central figure is a young lady—who tells the tale—and its purpose seems to be to show how a good young woman can make a good young man; as the "damoyse" in the "Morte d'Arthur" carried the Holy Cup to Sir Percival and forthwith "he was whole" of his wounds. The surroundings are of the nineteenth century, the period only vaguely marked, but since the setting up of the telegraph. There is an overpowering Duke, sufficient by himself to impregnate the very leaves of Messrs. Macmillan's book with the odour of aristocracy; a duke who talks of himself and his son as "nobles"; and who wears the ribbon of the Garter (or some other very refined order) when he dines by himself. He lives in a house surrounded by "miles of chase and forest," which is described as to all its fronts and courts and rooms and staircases as minutely as if it were to be the scene of a horrible murder. Instead of that, it becomes a frame for nothing more thrilling than Miss Clare's declaration of agnosticism—one of the best bits of comedy in the book. The heroine—not Miss Clare—exercises a very remarkable influence over the young Sir Percival; and their "goings on," which comprise a considerable amount of love-making and reading of Keble, are very pleasantly described. She seems to do it, chiefly, by a kind of subtle invisible radiation from her pure and ardent mind; and she herself is subject to a highly-refined and Anglicanized species of visions. Mr. Shorthouse writes as a believer in Anglicanism of the ideal order, which unites extreme ritual with

the most practical philanthropy, and at the same time feeds its mind on the most lofty and abstract conceptions—the mention of which, as we need not say, suggests to the author to introduce the name of Plato. Mr. de Lys is the Anglican clergyman who cultivates these ideals; and he, apparently, has inherited them from a grandfather who had been a Jansenist of a most superior description, badly persecuted by the Jesuits. He does not do much in the tale (except lunch with the Duke), until the end, where he is recklessly allowed by the author to print out a whole sermon; a sermon which holds up “ideals” in that manly and gushing style which imitators of Kingsley and Robertson affect, and which ends with a word or two of Greek, extremely soothing, no doubt, to the tradesmen and labourers who are supposed to be the audience. Sir Percival does not, we regret to say, marry his fair Mentor, though it is only justice to him to add that he makes every effort to do so. He goes off to the “West Coast,” and dies, in company with an Anglican bishop, the two having first received the Sacrament by swallowing three blades of grass “with intention!”

For the Old Land: a Tale of Twenty Years Ago. By the late CHARLES J. KICKHAM. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.

IRISH life among the farming classes is delineated in these pages with full knowledge of all their peculiarities, and with, perhaps, too great an elaboration of details. Protracted conversations between minor characters, leading up to nothing in particular, are occasionally introduced, and the force of the narrative is weakened by diffusion into a number of channels. The Dwyer family are cleverly sketched, their thriftless habits being combined with much that is interesting. They eventually lose their farm in consequence of voting against the landlord at a contested election, and emigrate to America. Tom Dwyer, the son, takes a distinguished part in the Civil War, and returns to his native place as a Fenian, and marries the girl of his choice. The motive of the book seems to be to illustrate the unfortunate position of the tenant farmer at elections, driven by the landlord on one side and by the parish priest on the other. This grievance we need scarcely say has now become obsolete.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

FRENCH PERIODICALS.

La Controverse. 15 Septembre. 1886. Lyon.

The Causes of Spanish Decadence in the XVI. and XVII. Centuries.—In an article with this title, Dom Jules Souben, a Benedictine of Ligugé, endeavours to trace the causes which determined the rapid decadence of Spanish power during the period named. It is a brief—indeed too brief—but careful and valuable article. The

wholesale emigrations which followed on the Spanish conquests in the New World, together with the economic consequences of those emigrations; foreign wars; excessive taxation; the neglect of the mechanical arts and all manual labour by the people, and their lapse into a general condition of laziness that became proverbial—these, it is here suggested, were the fundamental causes of Spanish decadence. The false direction given by the Government to public wealth, the failure of a nation, which did not know how to conserve the beginnings of glory and prosperity—these; but nowhere, says the writer, do I find as causes the hand of the Church or of the interfering Inquisition, in spite of the loud assertions of anti-Catholic writers. Transpose the causes of Spanish decadence to Holland or England, and the Protestantism of these countries would not have saved them from a like fate. And again, on the other hand, the Basque provinces, inhabited by the most religious people of the Peninsula, escaped the misery of the central country. Why? There the soil was less fertile; while the Inquisition simply “flourished” there! Yes; but the Basques escaped the excessive taxation of Castile and the scourge of wars, while attachment to their own soil limited emigration from among them, and a love of labour and modest simplicity of life did the rest. The author then replies at length to three serious arguments opposed to his theories, whereby it is sought by some writers to account for the result of Spanish deterioration (1) the unequal assessment of taxation—*i.e.*, the asserted (wrongly asserted, as is here shown) exemption from taxation of the clergy and nobility; (2) the expulsion of the Moors, and (3) of the Jews. After some very interesting information on the condition and doings of the Moors, Dom Souben concludes that their expulsion from the Peninsula was an extreme and cruel measure, but almost an inevitable one, one, too, in keeping with Spanish temperament, with the wish of the nation and with the very nature of things at the time.

Religion and the Prosperity of a Nation.—Dom Souben has some introductory remarks on the nature of the part which religion may be expected to play in a nation’s material affairs, which are worth mentioning. Much is said about the fanaticism of the Spaniards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and I do not, he observes, wish at all to exclude religion from the list of causes effective over the course of Spanish progress. But we must not exaggerate its action. And we must not confound together the natural and the supernatural orders. Religion has not been instituted to help man to the highest sum of temporal felicity. Doubtless religion will, or ought, powerfully to contribute to temporal good, and that in various ways; but it has not been given to man to supply where there is either a want of political sagacity or short-sightedness in a government. In a given country its religion may be bad but its government excellent, and there the people may develop largely intellectual and artistic faculties: look, *ex. gr.*, to the ages of Augustus and Pericles, or the period of the Caliphates of Bagdad and

Cordova. On the other hand, a nation's religion may be excellent and its government execrable; material interests may there suffer and the nation lose its preponderance. Thus with Spain. St. Teresa thanked God for having given Spaniards a fertile soil and a fine climate; she prayed that He would add to His favours a good government. Unfortunately the government went from bad to worse, and the saying of Louis XIV. remains as true as it is cruel: "After more than a century of bad government, there is no government at all under Charles II."

Of the articles in the October number we may mention one by M. Albert du Boys, well known in this country by his *Life of Catherine of Arragon*, entitled "*Une revanche de la liberté religieuse sur le tombeau d'un martyr*," the martyr being St. Thomas of Canterbury. The article gives a narrative—founded on the most recent materials—of St. Thomas's struggle for the interests of the Church and the repentance and penances of his adversaries and murderers. The writer then goes on to inquire how far the King really carried out his promises at the tomb and furthered the objects for sake of which St. Thomas had died. This last portion deals chiefly with some assertions of Mr. Froude in one of his essays in the *Nineteenth Century*. An article by M. Paul Allard on the condition of Christians under the Emperor Claudius (A.D. 268–270) bristles with that erudition for which the writer is so well known. There are several philosophical and archæological articles, one, the conclusion of a series, entitled "*A Theory of Free Will*," is by the Abbé Elie Blanc, Professor of Philosophy at Lyons, by whom is also written the "*Bulletin Philosophique*" of this number; another article is by the Abbé Hamard, on the "*Antiquity of Man*;" another, by the Dean of the Catholic Faculty at Lyons, M. Valson, is on the "*Origin of the World*;" and still another, contributed by Père Van den Gheyn, concludes a series on the "*Science of Religions*." The articles generally are that combination of a readable style and familiarity with the latest advances of scientific criticism which make *La Controverse* one of the most attractive of the French periodicals.

GERMAN CATHOLIC PERIODICALS.

By Dr. BELLESHEIM, Canon of Aachen.

1. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach.*

Mr. Edwin Arnold's "Buddha."—"The Light of Asia" is the title of the brilliant article contributed by Father Christian Pesch. It seems to be quite necessary that Continental Catholics should become acquainted with the current fashionable systems of either philosophy or philosophy of history, adopted by modern anti-Christian scholars in England. Foremost among those writers who seem determined to put Buddha on an equality with Our Lord, is the author of the "*Light of Asia*." Father Pesch, being well

informed in history and philosophy, unanswerably shows that, in Edwin Arnold's hands, Buddha has ceased to be the real person known to historians by that name, and that, on the contrary, what Mr. Arnold praises and holds up to the admiration of the world is the Indian philosopher wearing a mask of Christian features. In this way Mr. Arnold may easily succeed in recommending his hero to the world; but he can do it only by infringing the first law of human investigations—the law of truth. Hence his poem, however skilfully composed and enhanced by brilliancy of language, will be pronounced by sober scholars to be destitute of anything like permanent value.

Papal Arbitration in the Sixteenth Century.—Father Arndt comments on "a Papal arbitration in the sixteenth century." The case of 1885 was not the first time that the Holy See had used its influence in the interests of peace between conflicting nations. One of the most memorable events in the reign of Gregory XIII. is the treaty of Iam Zapolski, by which the Pope succeeded in putting an end to the war between Stephen Bathory, King of Poland, and Iwan, the great Prince of Moscow. The principal person acting for the Sovereign Pontiff was F. Possevin, S.J. Doubtless it has been this which prompted Father Pierling to search the Vatican archives for documents shedding more light on one of the most brilliant pages of pontifical history in that age. Modern historians, with not very friendly feeling towards the Holy See, have been most careful to distort facts, so as to depreciate the Pope's noble exertions for bringing together Poland and Russia. Of course it cannot be denied that, in fact, the treaty involved many advantages for Poland. But what a certain school of historians insist upon, is an assertion that the peace fostered anarchic elements, and destroyed what seemed to forebode a better future. Helped by the solid works of Father Pierling and other *savants* of our time, Father Arndt traces the course of events which led to Father Possevin's mission into Russia, the noble exertions of the Papal envoy for establishing peace between the two nations, and his endeavours to combine their forces for waging war on the Turks. During the twenty-eight days that Possevin resided at the Russian Court he had several audiences with the Czar, who, notwithstanding all the pleadings of the ambassador of Rome, could not be induced to submit to the Pope as spiritual head of the Church. On the contrary, the same prince who had applied to the Pope, entreating him to effect peace between Russia and Poland, in a fit of fury poured his anger against Gregory XIII., in the nuncio's presence. The mission proved on the whole to be successful, since a peace was established which lasted for twenty years; and the only one with whom fault is to be found for perpetuating schism severing the Russian Church from Rome, the centre of Christendom, is neither the Pope nor his ambassador, but the Czar.

The Edict of Nantes.—The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes is the subject of a series of thoughtful articles, thus headed, which

are contributed by Father Genelli. Having dwelt on the contents of the Edict, he explains the reasons which moved Louis XIV. to abolish the famous Edict by means of which Henry IV. had assigned to French Protestantism a position of which the adherents of the new religion had endeavoured to make the best for almost a century. The favours Henry had shown to his old co-religionists had by degrees created a state within the state. A main point to be insisted upon in reference to this subject, is the fact that the Edict was not at all a public treaty, binding two concluding parties, but only a decree issued by the secular power, which, therefore, was fully justified in altering and modifying it. The author of the Revocation of the Edict was Louis XIV. himself; it was not his minister Louvois, and still less was it his confessor, Père de la Chaise. Indeed, as to the latter, all the documents which have of late been dragged from the dust of archives combine in describing him to have been a man of great meekness, and indulgent rather than severe in judging his neighbour. Much interest attaches to that part of his study where Father Genelli examines the position of the Holy See. Innocent XI. never approved of the cruelties committed by Louis XIV. against Protestants, which are known by the name of the dragonades. On the contrary, he rebuked the King for trying that manner of converting those outside the pale of the Church. Yet it is true that when the King, by his ambassador, Cardinal d'Estrées, informed the Pope of his having abolished decrees too favourable to Protestants, Innocent XI. praised him; but it was only "for that way which our beloved son, the Duke d'Estrées, thy ambassador has made known to us." In other words: Far from being unqualified, the praise bestowed on the King was apparently restricted to that mode of acting of which the Holy Father had been informed. In summing up the contents of these remarkable essays, we may confidently conclude: the abolition of the Edict of Nantes was simply and purely an act of French statecraft, aiming at thus effecting both the political and the religious unity of the realm, the plan adopted was the work of the French ministry, and lastly, only State means were employed for bringing about this great and far-reaching change in the public life of France.

Janssen's History of the German People.—Father Baumgartner contributes a solid article on the fifth volume of Professor Janssen's history of the German people. His volume deals with the period immediately preceding the outbreak of the thirty years' war (1618–1648), a war which ravaged the whole of Germany, and rent it asunder, so that thenceforward the great nation was divided into numerous principalities, set up against the central power of the Emperor, and affording constant opening to the influence and intrigue of foreign powers inimical to the continuance of such fundamental national union as remained. By far the most interesting part of Janssen's new volume seems to be his description of the baneful effects consequent on that disgraceful literary polemic against Catholics which was opened by the Centuriators of Magdebourg.

Indeed, an unprejudiced mind having perused this part of the work will certainly not be surprised by even so terrible an event as the thirty years' war; the religious polemic of the Protestant theologians and cynical poets had well prepared the way for it. Hence one hopes that both Catholics and Protestants will attentively peruse this work; they can scarcely fail to be impressed alike with a conviction of the immense damage entailed on Christianity by the Reformation, and of the need of combining their powers in the effort to defeat the common enemy of Atheism and Materialism.

2. *Historisch-politische Blätter.*

Theological Professorships in Prussia.—The September number of this magazine has a clever article on the battle about the theological faculties on the part of Catholics and Protestants. As regards the Catholic Church in Prussia, the general rule in the appointment of professors of theology in the faculties of universities, is a nomination, issued by the crown, and the "missio canonica," after due approval given by the bishop. By this method of acting the rights of the Church are quite recognised. For some time a movement has been making itself felt in German Protestant quarters towards obtaining greater freedom for the Church from the State bonds. The larger measure of freedom is principally claimed in the nomination of the professors of Protestant theology; and this very sad experience has brought home to pious Protestants the dismal ravages committed by some of their professors who are constantly at variance with the public confession of their Church. But our author points out the unreasonableness of such a demand, since, in the very beginning of Protestantism, the government of the Church was entrusted to the secular power. It is one unavoidable consequence of this act of the Reformers, and one fated to continue, that the call to professorships will be exclusively from the Government.

Subsidies of Innocent XI. to the Emperor Leopold I. for the Turkish War.—Dr. Meurer contributes three solid articles, founded on extensive studies in Austrian and Italian archives, on the large subsidies sent to Leopold I. by Innocent XI., to help on the war against the Turks. As the rescue of Vienna in 1683 to a large extent is due to the Pope, so, too, is it to him that Austria, nay, all Christendom is indebted for the liberation of Buda in 1686. Had it not been for the energy and sagacity displayed by Cardinal Buonvisi, who acted for many years as Papal nuncio at the court of Vienna, and for the subsidies sent by Innocent XI., Buda would have remained for another century in the power of the Sultan.

Biography of St. Bernard by Dr. Hüffer.—Another article in this number of the *Blätter* treats of the introductory volume to Dr. Hüffer's Life of St. Bernard, of which a notice will be found on another page of the present number of this Review.

3. *Historisches Jahrbuch der Goerres-Gesellschaft.*

Politics of Clement VII.—Dr. Ehse deals with the subject of the politics of Clement VII. from 1523, when he was elected successor to Hadrian VI., up to the battle of Pavia, in which Charles V. defeated Francis I. Modern historians find fault with the Pope for want of thoroughness in his politics. But in his defence, due allowance is to be made for his exalted position as Father of all Christians, and hence also of rival princes, no less than for the fact that, being an Italian sovereign, he was obliged to vindicate the independence of the Pontifical States.

The Life of Von Ranke.—By far the best contribution is a sketch of Professor Ranke's life and various writings, by Baron von Reumont. Not many German historians are so well known in England as the late Professor Ranke, whose history of the Popes was so favourably introduced in the *Edinburgh Review* by Macaulay. Both this work and his "History of England in the Seventeenth Century" have been translated into English. Ranke's "History of England" now-a-days seems to be superseded by the recent work of Mr. S. R. Gardiner. Though largely known in England by his book on the Popes, his English history did not succeed to the same extent, probably because he seemed to show a certain amount of predilection for the Tories, although he did not shrink, unlike Disraeli, from severely censuring Charles I. Baron von Reumont's remarkable essay ought to meet with a large circulation in England.

Rev. — Schwarz contributes some unpublished documents from the Vatican archives, as useful for tracing the character of Dr. Gropper, the learned representative of German Catholics in the Diet of Ratisbon in 1541, to whose sound doctrine and unflagging zeal the Archdiocese of Cologne owed its fidelity in adhering to the Catholic faith.

Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie (Innsbruck).

Father München contributes an article on the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and Father Duhr writes on Father Edward Petre, S.J., privy councillor of James II., and deals with the charges brought against him by Protestants and by not a few Catholic authors. An English version of this able article on Father Petre has appeared in the November and December numbers of *The Month*, to which I may refer the reader without further remark.

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Civiltà Cattolica, 6 Novembre, 1886.

The Deluge.—The question of the Deluge and the obscure problems connected with it have always, more or less, exercised the minds of scientists; but of late years it has become the subject of

much wider and more animated discussion, particularly as regards two points: 1. Its universality; whether and within what limits may or ought to be restricted the absolute universality which the Bible, *primâ facie*, seems to attribute to it, and which all early commentators have taken for granted. 2. As regards the physical explanation of the Deluge and its connection with other now well-ascertained geological facts. The Abbé Motais, in a recent work entitled "*La Deluge Biblique devant la Foi, l'Ecriture, et la Science*," entertained the bold proposition, already advanced or favoured by Cuvier, Quatrefages, Lenormant, and other distinguished philosophers, as serving better to explain the origin of the yellow and black races, that the Deluge was restricted to the descendants of Seth and the region they occupied, the rest of the human race being exempt. The Abbé maintained his argument with much ability, and laboured to prove that such an opinion was not repugnant either to Scripture or to the Catholic faith. His thesis has found supporters even among Catholics; but it has also met with strenuous opposition. The *Civiltà Cattolica* is of opinion that it will never make much way, should it not even suffer shipwreck by incurring censure. Most of the Catholic exegetists of the present day, and those of the highest authority, are inclined to adopt a medium view, which, while excluding the *absolute* sense of the term universal as applied to the Deluge, would attribute one which may be called relative; that is, it would comprise the destruction of the whole human race and the submersion of that portion of the earth peopled by them, along with the animals it contained.

In this opinion Alberto Cetta, the author of a valuable work on the subject of the Deluge, which has been recently published, coincides in the main; but he adds several remarkable suggestions of his own, which are reviewed at some length in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, but to which we can but briefly advert. While holding that the Noachian Flood was not universal in the sense of having literally covered the tops of the highest mountains on the whole surface of the globe, he opines that throughout the regions already peopled by man this divine judgment had the completeness threatened by God and described in Genesis as actually witnessed by Noe and by those enclosed with him in the Ark. In extent, therefore, the completeness of the submersion was local, not universal. Moreover, he holds that there may have been, and probably were, disturbances, contemporaneous, or approximately so, in all other parts of the earth, by which it was more or less convulsed, without being totally submerged. This view he considers to be perfectly reconcilable with Scripture, as well as most agreeable to general tradition; and not only reconcilable with the Scriptural account but more consistent, for he sees indications of its truth in the very language of God to Noe, in which the cataclysm is certainly described as universal, although the expressions which speak of every living creature perishing need not be understood in an absolute sense, such expressions being used with an implied

restriction in various parts of the Bible: and he instances in particular Acts iii. 11, "every nation under heaven," an assertion apparently absolute, but obviously having a limited sense. So far, indeed, from its being necessary to conclude that all living animals at the time of the flood, save those in the Ark, perished, the contrary is more than implied in Gen. vi. 7, where "all the beasts of the earth" are mentioned in contradistinction to those which came forth out of the Ark in order to their being included in the covenant which God was establishing. The Deluge, then, he believes to have been a cataclysm which, while affecting more or less all parts of the globe, utterly destroyed the whole human race, with the exception of the individuals preserved in the Ark, and entirely obliterated the regions which they had peopled. Such was the Noachian Deluge, as threatened by God and described by Moses. Several other very interesting questions are touched on by the author, with reference to the supposed survival of other branches of Adam's descendants, observes that the difficulty which this hypothesis presents to him is but thrown further back, and is in no wise removed.

The greater part of Lami's work treats of the second question, and the various explanations of the Deluge, the secondary causes of this disaster, its date, its effect, and its traces, *con. to which*, indeed, these observations on its universality are but a preliminary. The various matter seems to have been handled by him with great ability and learning, and we need scarcely say that it is one of exceeding interest. The reviewer promises to return to the subject in a future volume.

The Nebuchodonzor of Judith.—This is the second article which has appeared in the *Revue* touching upon the identity of the personage. In the first, the reviewer simply collected the numerous opinions which have been held upon this debated question. In the present number selection is made of such as are at all entitled to consideration. The writer is, however, some all heterodox views, and confines himself to the opinions of Catholics, who accept from the Bible of the Bible the fact of Judith as historical, and therefore firmly accept, and presuppose its historic reality. After making this selection, the writer imagines less than fifteen kings is wanting to represent the Nebuchodonzor of Judith is offered to us, but the reviewer has a difficulty in eliminating five of the names on the probable authority of numerous inscriptions which in the time that they met with their several advocates. The candidates are thus reduced to two, viz. Syrian kings, for Persians and for Mesopotamians. These last are Nebuchodonzor, the Great Assyrian, Assuradon, and Merodach Baladan. The reviewer chooses at one made of Assuradon. Even three centuries ago, Nardi, Senari, a celebrated commentator, by the rule of chronological computation, had proved that the Nabuchodonozor was not an Assyrian, but a Persian, and that the Nabuchodonozor of Judith must have been a king of Assyria. Petavius and Tassin subsequently

arrived at a like conclusion. But the name of this monarch had been buried in the oblivion of twenty-two centuries, to revive, with many of the great deeds of his memorable reign, by the discovery of the indelible inscriptions on the cylinders of Ninive. This king Assurbanipal was contemporary of Manasse, king of Juda, during a portion of their respective reigns; and to that period we have every reason to refer the events recorded in the Book of Judith. No other pretender will satisfy the conditions required by the narrative. He is described in the text (i. 5) as "King of the Assyrians, who reigned in Ninive, the great city." Ninive, therefore, was still great and flourishing, and cannot yet have suffered the destruction foretold by Tobias and inflicted by the Medes and Babylonians in the year 625 B.C., or somewhat later. Up to that date it had remained the capital of the Assyrian empire, but with that empire it fell, never to resume its splendour or importance. If this be so, and the reviewer supports his argument by strong proofs, it is clear that the Nebuchodonosor of Judith cannot be found among any of the kings who reigned after the year 600. The conclusion at which he satisfactorily arrives is that not one of the Chaldean, Persian, or Greek sovereigns who reigned in Western Asia during and subsequent to the seventh century before Christ can satisfy the fundamental conditions laid down by the Biblical text already quoted; that is, not one of them can be identified with the Nebuchodonosor who reigned in Ninive, the great city, a description which fully agrees with that of Jonas the prophet, when sent to threaten it with destruction. Having thus removed objections, the reviewer purposes to examine in a future article the proofs which militate in favour of the view he has himself advanced.

Notices of Books.

The Life of Jean Baptiste Muard. (Library of Religious Biography. Edited by EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. Vol. ix.) London: Burns & Oates. 1886.

IN noticing a fresh volume of Mr. Healy Thompson's admirable biographies, we can only repeat what has been said of all the preceding volumes, that it is scholarly, edifying, and in the best sense popular. The present work, however, may claim to be exceptionally interesting. Père Muard's life has been written before; but Mr. Thompson has had access, not only to a number of sworn depositions not yet published, but to a document which makes this volume of supreme importance and value—to a diary, that is to say, of the venerable man's personal companion, covering the whole of

his life, from the time he resigned his parish, and began his disinterested work. This diary, or life, exists in manuscript at Buckfast Abbey, and Mr. Thompson has been fortunate in being permitted to see it. It is only to be regretted that the manuscript itself has not been printed. The reader feels, as he goes through the pages of the narrative, that the very words of the saintly man's companion would have had a charm which no mere transcription can give; and Mr. Thompson, it is only right to say, expresses the same feeling himself.

Père Muard was one of those plain, simple, devoted French priests, of whom St. Vincent de Paul, and the Curé d'Ars are the brightest examples, who move mountains without a single brilliant natural gift. Born of a peasant stock, he was seven years old at the downfall of Napoleon, and he died in 1855. For nine years he was a parish priest in the diocese of Sens; that is, from 1834 to 1843. During that time he began to feel himself called to a special life of penance, combined with preaching. With the sanction of the Archbishop he instituted at Pontigny, in the ancient Abbey Church where the relic of St. Edmund of Canterbury rest, a humble Congregation to carry out this double purpose. But as his vocation became clearer, he saw that he must have the religious life and vows to enable him to do what God called for. He, therefore, set off for Rome, with only two companions, a priest (the Père Benoit, who has written the life referred to), and a brother. After drifting about for a few months they found themselves at Subiaco. Père Muard had at first (as was very natural) thought of the order of St. Francis. But the Father Guardian of St. Bonaventura received him with a "covered irony," which seems not to have been very successfully covered after all, for Mr. Thompson adds that "there was no mistaking" it. The wanderers could get nothing from St. Francis, nothing from St. Bernard (to whom they appealed in the person of the Abbot of Santa Croce), and nothing from any one in Rome. But the Abbot Defaxy, of St. Scholastica's, at Subiaco, took to Père Muard at once; and, during the stormy winter of 1847-48 the three mortified companions prayed and meditated near the Holy Grotto of St. Benedict. It was here Père Muard desired to adopt the Benedictine rule. Returning to France, he obtained as a gift a desolate and rocky spot called "La Pierre-qui-vire" (the Rocking-stone), where he built a humble monastery on the site of an ancient diuidical circle. Mr. Thompson is not at all clear as to where *Pierre qui vire* exactly is; but it seems to be in the diocese of Sens, near the small town or village of St. Leger, not far from Avallon, and not very far from Auxerre. It would be in the department of Yonne, and the ancient province of Burgundy—(a good cure, who went with Père Muard on a terrible walk to look for a site for building, made the mistake of recommending one spot because it seemed just the place for good Chablis!) It was here that the holy man gathered a small community about him, which kept up the divine office and the sacred liturgy, practised a

most severe life, and gave missions in the diocese. The founder, however, died before the rule was approved by the Holy See. After his death, in 1855, Pope Pius IX. united his community with the Cassinese Benedictines of Abbot Casaretto's reform, and they founded one or two other houses in France. In 1880 they were expelled from Pierre-qui-vire, like the other congregations, and after a short time settled at Buckfastleigh, in Devonshire, where they now are. This biography by Mr. Thompson relates all this with great variety of edifying detail. There are amusing stories, too, scattered up and down the pages, which will attract readers who may require some such little inducement to read a "spiritual" book. The impression it leaves upon us is that Père Muard had no very striking trait of character. The great characteristic of a saint—and we may venture without anticipating the judgment of the Church to call Père Muard a saint—is of course his sanctity; that perfect love of God which shows itself in heroic practice. But of the saints, some have left inspired writing, some have wrought wondrous miracles, some have been great preachers; others have laid down their lives or suffered heroically. There is nothing very striking in this life, except, perhaps, the saintly man's wonderful abstinence. But there is abundance of edifying matter—sayings, letters, acts of devotedness, pastoral solicitude, and answers to prayer. Whatever may finally be the judgment of the Holy See on Père Muard's spirit, it is certain that his holy career has left its mark not only on his own diocese and in France, but on the spiritual life of thousands who have been encouraged to penance and devotion by his words and example. This book is sold for the benefit of the struggling community at Buckfast, and all who are interested in antique observance, in the conversion of England, and in Benedictine progress, should assist in making it known.

Souls Departed: being a Defence and Declaration of the Catholic Church's Doctrine touching Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead.
By Cardinal ALLEN. Edited by Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R.
London: Burns & Oates. 1886.

IT is to be hoped that the reader who takes up this very interesting reprint may not require the advice given him by Father Bridgett—to dip into it at two specified places so as to be "encouraged" to read the whole work. Allen thought that the doctrine of purgatory "touched the very core of heresy." No doubt it does; embracing as it does the practical answer of the Church to the Lutheran justification by faith, and the Calvinistic fatalism. Nothing can be more complete, nothing more effective, nothing more moderate and scholarly than this treatise of the great English confessor and organizer on purgatory and prayer for the departed. Not only is it not out of date at the present day, but there is no modern work of the sort in English or French, so far as we are aware, which is either half so persuasive or half so eloquent. Allen writes in long, striding sentences, as Campion wrote, and as

Jeremy Taylor wrote; but the phrase is so true in its aim, the rhythm so pleasing, the balance of epithet so just, that one forgets the slight archaism of the construction. Father Bridgett deserves the thanks of all English-speaking Catholics for rescuing this splendid piece of polemic from oblivion. We trust that its reception will be such as to encourage him to give us more from the same source. The book is prettily got up, and excellently printed in handy form.

Purgatory, Dogmatic and Scholastic. By Rev. M. CANTY, P.P. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.

THIS is a meritorious manual for popular use, containing an exposition of the theology and scriptural proof of purgatory. The author is moderate, and proves his views very carefully, giving fairly complete reference to authority. For the preacher and the general reader this handy work offers great advantages.

History of St. Margaret's Convent, Edinburgh. With a Preface by the Most Rev. WILLIAM SMITH, D.D., Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh. Edinburgh & London : John Chisholm.

WHY should St. Margaret's publish an octavo volume of its history? In what way does the history interest the general public? St. Margaret's was the first religious house founded in Scotland since the Reformation; and in his preface, where he alludes to the vast advance of the Catholic faith and institutions in Calvinistic Scotland, Archbishop Smith considers that St. Margaret's Convent is deservedly numbered among the causes contributing to that result. "The history, therefore, of such an institution," he continues, "appears most opportunely at a time when the Convent is keeping its Golden Jubilee." It will be seen that this volume is in fact a chapter, and an interesting one, in the history of the Church in general and the revival of conventual life in Scotland in particular. Bishop Gillis was the first instrument whom Providence raised to effect the arduous task of reintroducing nuns into Scotland, and the early portion of the book gives an interesting sketch—all the biography there yet is—of this zealous prelate. A Canadian by birth, he was a Sulpician student, and in Paris a fellow-student of Dupanloup and other men of late eminence in France. The inspiration to try to restore religious orders to his own poor country came to him when making a retreat at La Trappe. Again, he made the acquaintance of the holy Abbé Baudoin, now declared Venerable, the founder of the order of religious women called the "Ursulines of Jesus;" and much he laboured at home and on the Continent, begging, &c., for the purpose he took to heart. Then Providence sent him his first candidates, two ladies, one a convert, the other a Catholic by birth; and these went to Chavagnes to the novitiate of the Ursulines in 1833, and returned to Scotland therefrom a year later with a small colony of French Sisters, eager volun-

teers in the work. Mr. Gillis (as he then was), had purchased a house, after much difficulty and opposition, and he built a chapel. In those days—fifty years ago—such a venture was regarded by numerous visitors with anything but an intelligent estimate.

One day, while the labourers were employed in digging the foundations of the chapel and excavating for the construction of the vaults, a Catholic gentleman (Colonel Macdonell) entered the grounds to see how they were proceeding. He was much amused by an old Presbyterian minister and his wife, who were gazing down into the excavation with looks of horror. At length one said to the other, "There will be deeds of darkness done here!"

This sort of thing seems, however, to have been the extent of what Protestant feeling permitted itself. Timid Catholics, who thought the undertaking rash and premature, raised many difficulties. At last, however, the chapel was complete, and the Sisters took up their abode in it. The house which had thus been converted into the first Convent and school for Catholic higher education for girls in Scotland, was known as "Whitehouse," and was not without literary associations; "for within its walls Principal Robertson wrote his 'History of Charles the Fifth,' Home his 'Douglas,' and Dr. Blair his famous 'Lectures.'" From this auspicious beginning onward to the present time the history of St. Margaret's is here told with oftentimes over-much detail: this redundancy is to be regretted, as the Convent story is, in fact, from one point of view, also a history of the Church in Scotland during the last fifty years, and as such is of general interest. After the death of Dr. Gillis, the Sisters have found true friends in Dr. Strain and in the present Archbishop, who has long been a friend and father to them. Excellent portraits of these three prelates, and of another very great friend and helper, the Rev. Alexander O'Donnell, and of the first sister, Sister Agnes Xavier Trail, adorn the volume, as also do some views of the Convent. Of the sister just named, the convert lady to whom we have already referred, a word ought to be said. A hundred pages of this volume are devoted to her, and very properly, both on account of the value and the interest of some autobiographical letters written to give an account of her wonderful conversion. She was a woman of more than ordinary ability, and writes with much graphic power of analyzing her feelings and describing events; and her marvellous familiarity with the language of the Old Testament gives her letters quite an agreeable flavour. She traces in these letters the steps by which, gradually, she was led from Presbyterianism to the Catholic Faith. Her conversion, it should be remembered, took place at a period (1828) when a convert to Rome was indeed a rarity—Mr. Ambrose Lisle Philipps and Father Ignatius Spencer had indeed come in, but few others; and she herself was a young Scotch lady who had been brought up in rigid religious training. She was religiously minded, felt deeply for the ignorance and superstition of Papists, and when she started abroad took a goodly supply of tracts with her for their enlightenment; moreover, she was clever and well educated, and had had offers of marriage. She bravely faced all

the social consequences, once she saw the truth. We shall not try to quote any portions of her own record—touching and instructive to a degree—of her mental struggles, and the way in which the light she had so long prayed for—the “kindly light”—led her on to the fullness of faith. It is a record to be read in full by those who are at all interested in such matters. Turning to the remembrances of this brave lady by her sisters in religion, we come across an odd story of a London beggar, which we should not have expected to find here; and we are tempted to add to our notice by quoting it. Sister Trail “was delightful,” we are told, “when she related anecdotes of her youth.” We should think so, judging by the one given :

Her cousin, the Hon. Mrs. Erskine, with whom she resided, had a lady’s maid who, one day, came to her mistress to announce her approaching marriage, and consequently to resign her situation. Mrs. Erskine had a great regard for the young woman, and made some inquiries about the future husband, all which were satisfactorily answered. When the wedding day approached the maid told Mrs. Erskine that her fiancé had taken a house in ——— Street, and that if ever her lady happened to be in that neighbourhood she would be very proud to see her. It happened, some months afterwards, that Mrs. Erskine, walking with a friend, was overtaken by a heavy storm of thunder and rain near the street named. The two ladies thought themselves fortunate in being near a friendly shelter, and went to the house of the *ci-devant* lady’s maid, who was delighted to see her mistress. Everything was in perfect order; the house was nicely furnished, the young woman neatly dressed. She offered her visitors tea, which was served with perfect attention to all the requirements of a refined tea table. Mrs. Erskine was much pleased to see her old servant so comfortable, and said, “I suppose your husband is still engaged in business; what trade does he follow?” The poor wife blushed and looked confused, but at last said, “Well, madam, my husband is an asker.” “An asker,” said Mrs. Erskine, “what sort of business is that?” It turned out, on explanation being given, that the man was a regular street beggar, who took his station on one of the bridges. He had held this post for years, as a supposed cripple, and received daily alms from the passers-by. Thus he made a good livelihood, and kept his wife in a comfortable home.

The Synods in English : being the Text of the Four Synods of Westminster, translated into English and arranged under Headings, with numerous Documents and References. By the Rev. ROBERT E. GUY, O.S.B., under the supervision of the Right Rev. Bishop HEDLEY, O.S.B., with a Preface by the same. Stratford-on-Avon : St. Gregory’s Press, Warwick Road. 1886.

IN this well-printed octavo volume we have a complete text of the Four Synods, translated and also arranged according to subject under headings for more easy consultation. It must be acknowledged that this last plan is an excellent one: it brings together the scattered rulings of the several synods, and shows, almost at a glance, both the extent of legislation on any subject and

the changes or progress in such legislation. One chapter gathers together the passages which can be grouped under the title "Bishops," whilst others unite the decisions regarding "Chapters" and "Canons," "Priests," "Singers and Ecclesiastical Music," "Regulars," "The Laity," &c. We may be permitted to quote a few of Bishop Hedley's words on the value of these synodal enactments. He says in the Preface :

It can hardly be denied that the text of our English synods does not receive from the clergy that amount of study and attention which it ought to have. . . . As regards the admirable and edifying paragraphs of spiritual admonition scattered up and down the various chapters, it is not too much to say that few ever recur to them at all. Yet the pages, especially of the Fourth Synod, which regard the priest's personal sanctification, his household, and his mission, contain what may truly be called a complete picture of priestly duty which will bear reading again and again. Words like these are better than any book of spiritual reading, for they are the words of the actual and present pastors of the English Church; they have the express approval of the Holy See; and they are adapted, in a most special manner, to the circumstances of the times in which we live.

On the special value of a translation of these decrees, synodal letters, briefs, bulls, and pontifical instructions into the vernacular, we will again quote the Preface, which is excellent throughout. But we must limit ourselves to these two short extracts :

The present version has been undertaken in the hope and belief that it will make the original, if not better understood, at least more accessible and more impressive. To read a text in a translation is like seeing an object in a mirror; we have a different medium, and new relations to surrounding objects. Thus a translation brings out shades of meaning hitherto latent; it awakens associations of imagination hitherto unstirred; it places antique phrases side by side with modern modes of speech; and it brightens and sharpens the thought and idea, by taking it out of a dead language and putting it into a living one.

It only remains for us to mention that Father Guy has, as far as we have seen, done his work of translating the decrees, &c., with great accuracy, and with considerable success as regards the reproduction of technicalities and curial forms of construction in readable English—this last by no means an easy task. Wherever recent documents bear on the subject-matter of the chapters, they are given, as, *e.g.*, the Bull *Romanos Pontifices*, the mode of procedure in ecclesiastical trials adopted and approved in 1884, &c. Finally, there is a sufficiently full index, which increases still more the value of a very useful volume.

Catholic Controversial Letters. By the Rev. PHILIP SWEENEY, D.D.
London : R. Washbourne.

MUCH to our regret, our welcome of this little volume has been unintentionally delayed. We may, however, comfort ourselves with the reflection that the volume is, in spite of its sub-

ject matter, of a quality that makes it as easy to recommend it now as when it was fresh, a year ago. Generally speaking, controversial letters lose their savour with the occasion which evoked them; it is not a little to the credit of these that they retain their interest. This is due to Dr. Sweeny's admirable method of dealing with his opponents; he does not lose his temper; he takes it for granted that they have their prejudices; he avoids mere reprisal or abuse, and only lets their objections and wild assertions influence him so far as to shape the course of his exposition of what Catholics do believe or think. Thus it happens that a series of newspaper replies bear reprinting together; the appearance of opponents whom one knows nothing of except indirectly is not tiring—it rather lends interest to the book. These opponents were of all shades of opinion—Churchmen, Dissenters, and free lances; and Dr. Sweeny's replies run through the long roll of charges against Catholics so familiar from frequent iteration, yet ever being repeated with slight variation and demanding new attention; the claims of the Church, the Real Presence, Cultus of the Saints, Mariolatry, Anglican Orders, Scripture, the Pope, and the rest of them—even the question of Disestablishment occupies one or two letters, one of which, by the way (the 25th), contains a page of considerable pathos (p. 93). Dr. Sweeny shows great facility in reproducing the teachings of theological treatises in untechnical and clear English; he knows what he knows, and is confident in his statements and firm in his reiteration of them when they have been confusedly treated in reply. He makes some good points here and there; we may mention as an example Letter 3, where he shows that the Catholic Church alone has made the poor *happy* by her charitable assistance, or Letter 14, where the jeer against the "slavish" spirit of the Catholic in his readiness to believe is accepted and made an argument of. The following quotation is a fair specimen of Dr. Sweeny's quiet manner and clear common sense. It occurs in the course of his reply to a claim which is constantly re-echoed just at present:—

The question, then, is, who are the true descendants of St. Augustine—they who constitute the Established Church, or that body which is in communion with the Apostolic See? The difficulty is easily solved by considering who they are who force the consideration of this question upon us. It is not the Church of England as a whole, but a party within it—a strong and increasing one certainly, but still no more than a party, and not yet fifty years old. The great mass of the Protestant population are bewildered, or laugh at, or are indignant at, the assertion of such "Catholic claims" on the part of their co-religionists, and such manifestations indicate that they see novelty in them. In common with many other priests throughout the land, I have the honour to serve a congregation who profess to have adhered to the Church of St. Augustine, though that adherence exposed them to the afflictions of many penal laws and made their lives most bitter. The immense multitude of Roman Catholics outside of England regard them as the true disciples of the great missionary, and would think it folly to doubt it; two-thirds of

those bearing the Protestant name look on them in the same light Who, then, is likely to be right—the immense Catholic and Protestant majority, or the comparatively small Ritualistic party?

1. *The Bible and Belief.* A Letter to a Friend. By the Rev. WILLIAM HUMPHREY, S.J. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.
2. *The Spouses of the King.* A Sermon by Father HUMPHREY, S.J. Preached at the clothing of two Sisters of Mercy, &c. Edinburgh, St. Catherine's Convent, Lauriston Gardens, 1885.
3. *Christian Marriage.* By the Rev. WILLIAM HUMPHREY, S.J. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

THE reputation Father Humphrey's previous works have acquired is of itself sufficient to secure for anything that comes from his pen a due share of public attention. "*The Bible and Belief*" cannot fail to obtain the thorough appreciation of every one interested in religious matters. There are the same indications of deep thinking and of painstaking labour, the same sound and clear exposition of Catholic doctrine which mark all his writings. The style is clear and well-fitted to the matter under treatment. In a recent letter entitled "*The Divine Teacher*," Father Humphrey addressed himself to the High Church Party; in the letter before us he writes more directly of members of the Low Church. The letter is divided into twenty short sections, each forming a solid and highly-finished link not easily broken. Starting from the indisputable fact that there exist certain genuine historical documents called the Sacred Scriptures, Father Humphrey leads us by a well-connected series of undeniable propositions to admit the infallibility of the Catholic and Roman Church "for which divine light [through the indwelling Spirit of Truth] streams upon the pages of the Sacred Scriptures." The conclusion to which the impartial reader must of necessity come, we prefer giving in the writer's own words. "Apart from [the divine teaching of the infallible Church] there is no solid reason why men should believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures. Men may hold it, but they hold it without rational foundation. It is a superstition."

We regret not to have noticed "*The Spouses of the King*" earlier. The style is graceful, and there is well-ordered arrangement. Those who have read "*Mary magnifying God*" will know how to appreciate the second division of this sermon, where the preacher shows how the espousal between God and Our Lady "is the prototype of all supernatural relations between the Creator and His creature." The comparison between the old age of "the virgin daughters of this world," and that of the virgin spouses of the King is drawn out with the vigour and insight we might expect from the author of "*The Religious State*."

"*Christian Marriage*" deals with a subject of utmost importance

in these days of legalized divorce. The only way for Catholics to persevere in fidelity to the Church's instincts amidst the growing sentiment of English public opinion is to have before them the Church's teaching on the nature of the marriage contract and the sacrament of matrimony. This is what Father Humphrey gives in this little volume of less than a hundred pages. It is only an outline, but it gives a sufficient sketch of what marriage is in the light of nature, and what when elevated into a sacrament by Christianity; and it gives the sketch in clear and terse English sentences. A very useful compend on a vital topic.

Der heilige Bernard von Clairvaux. Von Dr. GEORG HÜFFER, Privatdocent der Geschichte in Münster. 1 Band. Vorstudien. Münster: Aschendorff. 1886.

THIS volume contains the "preliminary studies" for a new Life of St. Bernard by Dr. Hüffer, who teaches history at Münster. Such a scrupulous careful study of all the available materials gives us a high idea of what we may expect from the Life itself, which we hope may not be long delayed. The numberless contemporaneous lives of St. Bernard have been carefully compared, so as to establish their several dates and degrees of trustworthiness. The critical skill and labour bestowed upon them is what we are accustomed to in the case of a classical author, rather than of the mediæval life of a saint; but the results (though necessary for our author's purpose) are too technical, and too exclusively connected with his work, for us to enter further upon them now.

His study of St. Bernard's letters will be of more general interest. All students of his works are aware of their large number, great beauty, and extraordinary range, both in subjects and in the persons to whom they are addressed. They will therefore be glad to hear that the researches made by Dr. Hüffer in person, or at his instance, have led to the discovery of nineteen or twenty more letters written by St. Bernard, and four addressed to him, all previously unpublished. None of them are of first-rate importance, though they confirm our previous conceptions of his character. Six of these have been found at Toledo, one at Lilienfeld, and one at Munich; but by far the larger number have been sent from England. Mr. Edmund Bishop, "whose services to the advancement of history need no praise from German students, whom he has so often counselled and assisted," discovered twelve in the British Museum Library, and two in C.C.C. Oxford. The great interest of these letters is to show us how much will be found in these priceless collections, when they come to be examined by sympathetic Catholic hands.

The Christian Priesthood. A Sermon delivered in the Church of St. Dominic's Priory, Woodchester, on December the 8th, 1885, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. George Vincent King, O.P., Bishop of Juliopolis. By the Right Rev. JOHN CUTHBERT HEDLEY, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport and Menevia. London: Burns & Oates.

“THE Christian Priesthood” is a subject of much importance in these days, and we have read with great relish Bishop Hedley's sermon under that title. His lordship proves that, for the keeping of God's presence in His Word and Sacraments here below, the priesthood is necessary. He carries us back to Isaias, who saw, not the priests of the old law, for “there was to be the pouring-in of strangers,” and the “sons of strangers,” but those of the present day. “Vos sacerdotes Domini vocabimini.” We are reminded by the sermon what we owe to priests; for “wherever they set their foot,” as the Bishop says, “they raised Christ's altar Under every star in every meridian they erected the altar of propitiation, and called down the Immaculate Lamb.” We recommend a perusal of this sermon, as it shows that “men come to God by the priesthood” of the Catholic Church.

Nomenclator Literarius Recentioris Theologiæ Catholicæ Theologos exhibens qui inde a Concilio Tridentino floruerunt. Edidit H. HURTER, S.J. 3 tomi. Oeniponte: Libraria Wagneriana. 1886.

THE first part of this very valuable manual was published in 1871; the concluding part of the third volume appeared only in October of last year. Father Hurter, professor in the University of Innsbruck, whose Dogmatic Theology is so well and favourably known, has now happily brought to a close a work which may be pronounced to be unique. He traces the development of Catholic theology in each of its departments since the time of the Council of Trent. The book is not a mere list of names; on the contrary, each author is sufficiently described and criticized, and the titles of his various works are stated with much exactitude. Each century is divided into several sections, at the end of which, well-arranged lists are given of authors, classed according to the departments of science they cultivated, and (what is specially interesting) to their nationality. The amount of labour thus skilfully expended by Father Hurter may be gathered from the fact, that the third volume contains no less than 1285 pages. Of course Great Britain and Ireland come in for their share of space and attention. It is to be regretted that the learned author, in criticizing the works of the late Augustus Welby Pugin, did not mention Pugin's biography, published several years ago, by Dr. Reichensberger (Freiburg: Herder). It is to be hoped that the “Nomenclator” will find its way to Catholic scholars of every country.

BELLESHEIM.

1. *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* Clementis VIII., Innocentii X. et Benedicti XIII. jussu editum : Benedicti XIV., et Leonis XIII. auctoritate recognitum. Editio typica. Ratisbonæ: Pustet. 1886.
2. *De vi Obligandi Libri "Cæremonialis Episcoporum"* Dissertatio. JOACHIM SOLANS. Ratisbonæ: Pustet. 1887.

HERR PUSTET has just brought out a very important liturgical publication—viz., a new edition of the "*Cæremoniale Episcoporum*." Its title-page is adorned with the name of Leo XIII., who, through the Congregation of Rites, has commanded the issue of this edition. And it was only becoming to entrust the task to Herr Pustet, who, as the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW know, has already presented the Catholic world with the "Editio typica" of the Missal and Breviary. This new edition of the *Cæremoniale*, too, will be the "typica," not merely in a general way, but by a special decree of the Congregation of Rites, of August 17, 1886. It is well to mention that every page of this edition, prior to its being put into type, has passed the strictest examination in Rome; and the text, therefore, may be considered as absolutely reliable. Further, in the preparation of this new edition, a pontifical commission has examined those parts of the text in which the Gregorian chants occur, with the result that not a few changes have been introduced, and former editions are now superseded. One, the most important, seems to be in lib. i. 27, where the melodies for collects are definitively prescribed. It only remains to add that paper, type, and get-up, are all of the high class now associated with the Pustet publications.

BELLESHEIM.

Annales Minorum, ab Anno 1612, usque ad Annum 1622, Continuati a P. F. STAN. MELCHIORRI DE CERRETO, et a P. F. EUSEBIO FERMEZDZIN aucti et editi. Tom. xxv. Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi), prope Florentiam: Typogr. Collegi S. Bonaventuræ. 1886.

WE are glad to introduce to English and Irish scholars the above volume, just issued from the excellent printing and editorial establishment of S. Bonaventure in Quaracchi, near Florence. Amongst the eminent theologians who adorned the Franciscan Order, which has so well deserved of Ireland by preserving her faith, native language, and monuments, Father Luke Wadding holds the first place. Born in Waterford in 1588, he was called to his reward in Nantes, 1652. As professor in Salamanca and founder of S. Theodore's, Rome, he has strong claims on the gratitude of Irish Catholics; whilst his "*Annales*" testify to his vast learning. Unhappily, he had not time allowed him to bring his great undertaking to a happy close. This task fell to his brethren in the Order. Volume xxv. has just appeared, under the care of F. Fermezdin, the present annalist of the Order. The

volume, which embraces the events from 1612-1622, had been originally collected by F. Melchiorri da Cerreto (1791-1871), but it has been revised and prepared for the press by F. Fermendzin. The latter may be congratulated on the happy result of his zealous exertions. The "Litteræ ad Principes" of the Vatican Archives and the Consistorial Archives opened up to him vast materials for illustrating the exertions of the Franciscans in every part of the world. Documents are here printed *in extenso*, and no pains has been spared to bring out a correct text, whilst their value is much enhanced by the Regesta and an excellent index. Any one who has been through the Vatican Archives will be able to appreciate the learning and diligence indispensably necessary for a momentous task such as this. Among the points deserving of special mention may be named the exertions of the Franciscan Fathers for the conversion of the Chaldaic Patriarchs, and again their efforts in seconding the desire of the Spanish monarchs for the definition of the Immaculate Conception. The third order of Franciscans should not be forgotten; we find interesting notices telling of the virtue and happiness which have accrued from that noble institute. Irish Catholics, as being particularly interested in their great countryman, Duns Scotus, will be pleased to learn how in the presence of the general of the Franciscans, James of Bagnocavallo, and the auxiliary Bishop of Cologne, his tomb was opened on January 13, 1620, and his remains laid in a more becoming place. For the study of ecclesiastical history in general, or of the religious Orders in particular, this splendid volume will be an indispensable auxiliary.

BELLESHEIM.

1. *St. Augustine, Bishop and Doctor; a Historical Study.* By a Priest of the Congregation of the Mission. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.
2. *S. Austin, and his Place in the History of Christian Thought.* By W. CUNNINGHAM, B.D. (The Hulsean Lectures, 1885.) London: C. J. Clay & Sons. 1886.
3. *St. Augustine, Melancthon, and Neander.* By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1886.

THE first of these works is a very interesting and careful study of the life and writings of St. Augustine by a Catholic priest who has personally visited Hippo and its neighbourhood. He considers that his attempt is the first that has been made to present St. Augustine to English readers with all his surroundings. We have the narrative of his early life, up to the time of his baptism (mainly taken, as might be expected, from the "Confessions"); we have his episcopate and his numerous labours for the Church and for souls; and we have a brief analysis of his innumerable writings. It appears to us that priests and readers generally will find much profit in this conscientiously written book. A life of St. Augustine

which largely quotes his own words, and an account of his writings which gives well-chosen extracts on controverted matters, will supply in many libraries a most definite want. Our author writes pleasingly, but without any pretence of fine writing. There is a small map.

Mr. Cunningham's Hulsean Lectures for 1885 are concerned with St. Augustine. He calls him "St. Austin," a form which he seems to consider more Anglican, though it is simply the English way of writing the word used by Harding and Cressy, equally with Hooker and Jeremy Taylor, and by our older priests within the recollection of many of us. Anglican lectures of the type of the Hulsean are very unsatisfactory reading. They are generally a cross between a sermon and a dissertation; they combine the boldness of science with the timidity of orthodoxy as only a "lecture" can do, and when they start a sprightly canter it is only to subside in a minute or two into the usual jog-trot of hortatory Anglicanism. But, apart from the difficulty of making such a mixture pleasant reading, Mr. Cunningham has produced a painstaking and learned book. He thinks that although the Anglican Church does not require to be reminded of a St. Ambrose to stir it up to earnest pastoral work, or of a St. Jerome to make it study the Bible, it does need the example of St. Augustine, the contemporary of both, to make it take an interest in Christian philosophical thought. Mr. Cunningham thinks that "we in our day, distracted with anxiety and doubt, may well turn to him—to him, perhaps, rather than to any of the Fathers of the Church" (p. 10). What, however, contemporary Anglicanism is to get from him, beyond a vague impulse to "follow in his steps" (p. 8), is not made very clear. Anglicans cannot be expected to agree with one who did so much to "encourage" mediæval monachism, scholastic theology, contemplative piety, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy (p. 16). Mr. Cunningham, as an Anglican, is necessarily without a definite opinion on the principal points of Christian revelation; and to expect to be able to impress his hearers with definite opinions by a study of the enormous mass of the Augustinian writings is like expecting to find crutches ready made in the wild luxuriance of a Central American forest. To a student of these Lectures, it would appear that St. Augustine was not clear whether the Church was one, or whether it could exist divided against itself (p. 119); that he held the sacraments to be means of grace, but not to convey grace (p. 133); that he held some kind of a Real Presence, but nothing definite, and that he has apparently said nothing at all about the sacrifice of the Mass (p. 198); that he never wrote that sentence about "Rome having spoken," and, indeed, ignored the Holy See; that he differed from the "scholastics" (which?) in his idea of God (p. 39); that he tried to reconcile (as the author tries to reconcile, with more "ifs" than even an Anglican bishop should be allowed to use) eternal punishment with ultimate restoration (pp. 72, 73); that "as far as one can judge" he would not have approved of the indiscriminate scat-

tering of the Bible, "with no real instruction, with no Church life to commend it" (p. 167); and that this milk-and-water conjecture is an adequate rendering of the famous sentence, "Ego vero Evangelio non crederem nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas." We do not wish to be unfair to a learned and earnest man, but to approach St. Augustine in order to learn what the Church believes can be no more successful than to try the same process with the Bible itself. It cannot be said, so far as we have noticed, that this book misrepresents St. Augustine; the writer certainly does not misrepresent him intentionally, although we think he has omitted some matters which should have been more explicitly stated. But in St. Augustine, as in every orthodox Father, there are two kinds of doctrinal statement: there are the points which had already been explicitly defined by the Church, and there are those which were actually in process of development, and in which there had not been definition; and in regard to the last class, there are again two classes of statement, or rather three: there are profound expositions and arguments, there are definite pronouncements which have been accepted by the Church, and there are definite opinions which the Church has not accepted, or has even rejected. An expositor of St. Augustine who does not approach him with clear views on these different matters will do little good with him as a teacher of doctrine: he may bring out his personal character, his "method," and his "insight"; but he will make next to nothing of him as a guide to a complete system of Catholic truth.

Professor Schaff has written a picturesque biography of St. Augustine from a Low Church-German-American point of view, and has done him the injury of binding up the article with two others on Melancthon and Neander respectively. Professor Schaff admires St. Augustine, but "deplores" a good deal in his system. He acknowledges that he said, "Roma locuta est, causa finita est," and that he anticipated the dogma of the Immaculate Conception (p. 89); but in describing what took place after St. Monica's death, he says that they celebrated the "Holy Supper" on the grave (p. 73), whereas St. Augustine himself says they celebrated the "sacrifice of our redemption" (*sacrificium pretii nostri*), not "on the grave," but simply before she was placed in the grave. (Conf. ix. 12.) The other biographies are interesting, when we have made due allowance for "correction" of the writer's theological status; that on Neander is especially full of curious detail.

Man's Knowledge of Man and of God. By R. TRAVERS SMITH, D.D.,
Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, and Canon of St. Patrick's, Dublin.
London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1886.

This volume consists of six discourses delivered before the University of Dublin at the Donellan Lecture in 1884-5. Dr. Travers Smith's chief object is to show in detail the very close analogy which exists.

VOL. XVII.—NO. I. [*Third Series.*]

Q

between belief in a personal man and in a personal God. From this it follows, in the first place, that if the former be accepted, a belief in the latter is also attainable. Secondly, it is shown that the difficulties which we have in believing the personality of God are the same in kind as those which meet us when we believe in human personality; moreover, the perplexities in our knowledge of human nature are inexplicable, unless we follow that knowledge out into a divine sphere. The scope is therefore a wide one, as it brings the author first to consider the nature of personality in self and in other human beings, with the suprasensuous elements, truth, beauty, the will and conscience, these are found to contain; so that "the recognition of the personality in one's fellow-man is a sort of religion." The same elements are then discovered in the personality of God, first as known by natural reason, then as revealed in the Trinity, which is shown to meet most perfectly the cravings of the human heart in communion with other kindred natures. In this extended field, there are few of the philosophical doctrines of the day that do not find their place. The author disclaims metaphysics, and his treatment of these difficult questions may be, perhaps, called too cursory to be conclusive for unbelievers; but it is clear, interesting, and persuasive for the general reader. We are glad to be able to add there is nothing in his teaching with which a Catholic would disagree, and hardly anything which he would otherwise express.

Philosophia Moralis, seu Institutiones Ethicæ et Juris Naturæ. Elucubratur a JULIO COSTA-ROSSETTI, S.J. Ed. altera. Oeniponte: Typis Feliciani Rauch. 1886.

THE first edition of this manual of Ethics was noticed in our pages in April, 1884. It is in every way one of the most satisfactory introductions to Morality which have come under our notice. Extending as it does to nearly 1,000 pages, it is large enough to take in the usual points and to deal with them at ample length. The demonstration of the "end" of man, and of its necessary connection with the existence of an Infinite Being is well and convincingly given. The explanation of Morality and the origin of the idea of Good and Evil is clear and, on the whole, sound. But there are many students who will demur to the writer's teaching on Obligation. He says that an action is recognized to be "obligatory" in the ultimate analysis because it is commanded—necessarily commanded—by God. The obvious reply to this is to ask another question: Why should an action be obligatory because it accords with the (necessary) will of God? And since a satisfactory answer (as it seems to us) may be given to this, it follows that the analysis of the author is not ultimate. What is generally taught is that the recognition by man, through the light of his reason, that an action is or is not conducive to what his reason recognizes as his "last end," is the base and ground of obligation.

The truths thus written on man's heart are rightly called a law; they are the effulgence in the soul of that eternal law, which is as absolute and necessary as God Himself, and in that sense they may be called His necessary will. But we do His will because He is what He is and we are what we are; not simply and absolutely because it is, in the abstract, His will. The difficult subject of "Jus" is ably treated. It is almost impossible to discuss this matter in English, because Jus means both "law" and "right," and the confusion is too bewildering. But we have always been tempted to think that the treatment of "right" and of "law" in the manuals is needlessly complex. All "right" springs from the fundamental "right" of a rational creature to use his faculties towards his last end. And "law"—we do not mean the *lex æterna*—is only the organization, the reconciliation by authority, of individual "rights," rendered needful by the social condition in which man necessarily lives. Father Rossetti treats of theories and forms of government. He is of that moderately democratic school which all true Jesuits honour. He does not, however, love a republic; but he equally dislikes absolute monarchy and elaborately praises the British Constitution. In regard to the origin of Property, our author is sound and sensible; but he does not touch the real modern difficulty in the theory of property—viz., the right claimed by capital to be the larger part of the increment produced by labour. A Christian moralist should be prepared to vindicate the capitalist who pays his workman a pound a week and pockets another pound as the profit of his work. The right to possess landed property at all is clearly laid down; but at the present moment a little more fulness of treatment would have been useful in a matter which is so much in discussion. In political and social economy, the writer, as was to be expected, is no follower of the dismal philosophy summed up in the words: *Laissez faire la misère, laissez passer la mort*. He is utterly against unrestricted production, free disposal of land, competition in wages, and (it would seem) free trade. A labourer has a right to a wage high enough to support wife and children; necessary articles of consumption must have their prices fixed by the State; the labour of women and children must be guarded by legislation; and the State must interfere in the interests of the public health and morality. Most of this is not new, at the present day. The older economists made "wealth" their *summum bonum*, and wrote out their theories on the supposition that the desire of wealth was the natural motive power of all human action and aspiration, with which it was irrational and even impious to interfere. But economists are growing every day more and more tender-hearted; and the programme of subjects in which the State may paternally interfere, which was given the other day at the Birmingham Meeting of the British Association, leaves an impression that there are very few things indeed in which it should not interfere. Father Rossetti's book, though on the details of economics it is necessarily meagre, and though he omits to demonstrate one

or two pressing truths, will be found a very complete and useful manual of Christian Ethics. The author had evidently printed the book before he saw the Papal Encyclical on the "Christian Constitution of the State," or he would have quoted some of its very apt passages. It may be said, in conclusion, that the work is written throughout in moderately strict scholastic form, with notes, an excellent index, and several tables.

-
1. *Expositio principii traditi a D. Thomæ Aquinate ad naturam investigandam rei materialis et rei immaterialis.* Auctore J. B. TORNATORE, C.M. Placentiæ: Typ. Francisci Solari. 1882.
 2. *De Humane Cognitionis modo, origine, ac profectu, ad mentem S. Thomæ, Doctoris Angelici.* Ejusdem auctoris. Placentiæ: Typ. "Divus Thomas." 1886.

THESE two metaphysical treatises seem to have first seen the light in a periodical published at Piacenza, known by the somewhat awkward name of "Divus Thomas," and devoted to the cause of Thomism. Whatever the scientific reader may think of them, they are evidence of a living interest in scholastic philosophy. A community which can produce, and which reads, essays such as these, on difficult metaphysical questions, and written in a very fresh and unconventional style, affords a most practical proof of the revival of scholastic study, so strongly insisted upon by Pope Leo XIII. The second of the two *opuscula* is on the Origin of Ideas. When the author had finished it, he seems to have found out what his readers probably will find out also, that he has put the cart before the horse. He has elaborately stated the Thomistic theory of knowing, both as regards the senses and the intellect. As to the first, there is not much to be said; he gives the ordinary teaching, and explains with commendable clearness what is meant by such words as the "sensible species," the "phantasm," and other technical terms. But in stating the process of intellectual cognition, he arrives at a theory which will surprise Thomists very much indeed. His view is, that the substance of the soul is one and the same as the act of knowing; that the very first thing we know is our soul itself; and that the "universal" or the generic ratio of being ("ens in commune"), which is the necessary element of all intellectual knowing, is the soul, and nothing else! Most students have hitherto read St. Thomas in a different sense. He is considered to teach that the soul's operation (the act of knowing) is as different from the soul's essence as the contraction of a muscle is different from the muscle itself, and that while the common or universal element in things is both gathered from them and given to them in one process, the soul herself cannot be known here below except by her reflection upon herself as she takes the successive "forms" of other things. Our professor, we must admit, quotes St. Thomas, and tries to read his commentary into the Angelic

Doctor's words; but it is here that we complain of his inverting the order of things. He ought to have placed St. Thomas's text first, and used it as a text. Instead of that he has given his own theories—theories which he admits are not clearly St. Thomas at first sight; and then, as a sort of afterthought, endeavoured to make them agree with the Master. We do not consider he has succeeded.

The first of the two works named was published three or four years ago. It is very hard reading. Nothing is so deep or so abstract as the primary constitution of Matter. The author, without intending an epigram, says very well that the first property of "*materia prima*" is its confusion, obscurity, and unintelligibility. He considers that the root of materiality—*materia prima*, in fact—is "primary and infinite mobility." This, no doubt, is something like the common teaching. The reader will find it dilated on in the brochure before us. St. Thomas, however, does not seem to have said as much. With him, mobility or mutability, is a sign of "compositeness"—the opposite to simplicity. But even a spirit is mutable; and there are some material beings which probably never change substantially. So that the test of "mutability" is not of much use in drawing the line of distinction between matter and spirit; and, if so, mutability in itself cannot be "*materia prima*;" it must be some very special mutability. Our professor calls it "primary and infinite mutability." But this is too vague. What the Catholic metaphysician has before him is, to find out and formulate that element in the material universe which makes those forces which compose it differ from what we know a spiritual force to be. It would almost seem that to try to define "matter" would be sure to result in as useless a tautology as if we were to attempt a definition of "self." The truth is, "matter" is everything—that is, except a kind of being which our reflection has discovered to us, and which has the power of making universals. You may describe "matter," but you cannot define it more nearly than this.

Impedimentorum Matrimonii Synopsis, seu Brevis Expositio, ad usum Seminariorum. Auctore G. ALLEGRE, S.T.D., &c. Editio secunda. Paris: Roger et Chernowiz; Marianapoli (Canada): Cadiaux et Derome.

THIS is a new edition of a very useful compendium of theological information on the Impediments of Marriage. The writer, whose name is not unknown in connection with works of devotion, has studied brevity, but he is very clear, and, as we think, sufficiently complete for all ordinary purposes. He writes chiefly for the clergy of France; but English-speaking pastors will find in his seventy pages a full discussion of most of the difficulties which arise in their own practice. An index would have added to the value of the book. There are one or two matters, moreover, which perhaps might usefully have been brought in; such as, for example, the *execution* of

dispensations. But for practical purposes the missionary priest will find in this most handy volume the opinions and views of the best authors laid down in terse and clear words, and the most recent decisions of the Holy See duly cited in their places.

1. *Theologia moralis*. Auctore AUGUSTINO LEHMKUHL, S.J. Two vols. Editio tertia ab auctore recognita. Friburgi: Herder. 1886.

2. *Compendium theologiæ moralis*. Auctore AUGUSTINO LEHMKUHL. Friburgi: Herder. 1886.

THE first and second editions of F. Lehmkühl's moral theology have been noticed in our pages. The work has happily found a large sale in so many countries, that within the space of two years a third edition has been found necessary. The author has brought out the third edition almost untouched; except that a few questions are treated more accurately or with more reference to the actual circumstances of our time. An example occurs (vol. i. p. 714) where is treated the much-debated question of the regulation of wages, so as to satisfy the just demands of both labourer and employer.

The gifted and zealous author has had the happy idea of bringing out a *Compendium*; we sincerely congratulate him on it. Being intended for the use of ecclesiastical students, it will, we have no doubt, be largely adopted, more particularly as it is throughout arranged in correspondence with the larger "*Theologia Moralis*;" by reason of which good arrangement students may use the *Compendium*, and their professors also consult the ampler explanations of the original manual. Should a second edition of the *Compendium* be published, we shall look for a list in it also of the leading theologians who have treated on morals.

BELLESHEIM.

Bibliotheca theologiæ et philosophiæ scholasticæ selecta atque composita a FR. EHRLÉ, S.J. *Aristotelis opera omnia quæ exstant brevi paraphrasi et litteræ perpetuo in hærenti expositione illustrata* a SILV. MAURO, S.J., ed opere FR. BERINGER, S.J. Tom. ii. Paris: Lethielleux. 1886.

OUR readers have already been made acquainted* with Fr. Ehrle's great undertaking of a new critically accurate edition, which is splendidly printed, of Silvester Maurus's Commentary on Aristotle's writings. The second volume, now before us, contains the Greek philosopher's treatises on ethics, politics, and economics. Any one at all acquainted with the history of Greek philosophy is aware of the threefold form in which Aristotle's ethics have been handed down to us: the ethics of Nicomachus, Eudemus, and the

* See April, 1885, p. 455.

"great morals." In Germany and France, in our times; the subtle examination of these writings has resulted in the opinion that only the Nicomachean ethics may be ascribed to Aristotle himself, and that the two others have come to us from Eudemus, a disciple of Aristotle, and another as yet unknown, a philosopher who abridged the writings of both Aristotle and Eudemus. Father Maurus had, however, two hundred years ago, anticipated this criticism, acting on it throughout his commentary. The ethics are here followed by Aristotle's doctrine on the State and family. The latter work, the so-called "Economics," is generally considered not to be genuine. The editor has adopted for ethics and politics the Latin translation of Lambinus (1572), Georges Valla, and Camerarius, whilst due reference is made to the Greek text of the well-known Berlin edition.

Regestum Clementis Papæ V: Ex Vaticanis archetypis, SS. D. N. Leonis XIII. jussu et munificentia nunc primum editum cura et studio Monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti. Annus II. et III. Rome: Typographia Vaticana. 1886.

IT is only six months since the first volume of this important publication, which is being issued by special command of the Pope, was brought before the notice of our readers.* The second volume, just brought out by the Benedictine Fathers, under the presidency of F. Tosti, is not less deserving of attention. It contains the documents bearing on the second and third years of Pope Clement's reign (1306-7). The editors in their preface mention that henceforth one volume will be allotted to each year, whence may be inferred that the present volume contains the matter of two. Further on the editors inform us that, having been commissioned to bring out only the Vatican documents, they intend to act according to this restrictive instruction. They will thus, it must be acknowledged, perform their work more easily and expeditiously; but we may be allowed to question whether this method should be regarded as best furthering the interests of historical science. Let me point out one striking instance as given in the history of the suppression of the Templars. A merely superficial look into Bishop von Hefele's "History of the Councils" leaves no doubt but that outside the Vatican archives there are existing large numbers of documents issued by Clement V. connected with the affair of the Templars, not to mention the almost countless other manuscript documents throwing light on other Christian countries beside France. Hence, even the exhaustive publication of Clement V.'s Vatican papers will by no means provide the student with the materials necessary for tracing that Pope's reign.

The documents contained in the present volume comprehend Nos. 1513-2302. They are not more extensive, owing to a severe illness of the Pope. For the most part they relate to ecclesiastical

* January, 1886, p. 205.

benefices, matrimonial dispensations, and the Holy Land. That the first Pope elected under decisive French influence was quite alive to the importance of Rome as the capital of Christendom, is strongly brought out by the solemn decree of June 16, 1807, by which Clement V. appoints his Vicar-General for Rome, "*quam divina clementia statuit caput vobis et ubi nostri sedem apostolatus coelestis dispositio stabilivit*" (ii. 27). Much interest attaches to the Pope's correspondence with the Tartar and Russian princes whom he supplies with bishops and missionaries of the order of Friars Minor. The political influence of England was very far-reaching at that time, and the English student will not be astonished to learn that a very large number of documents in this volume refer to the affairs of his own country.

BELLESHEIM.

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Being Grimm's Wilke's "*Clavis Novi Testamenti*," translated, revised, and enlarged. By JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1886.

THIS splendid and invaluable lexicon should be in every library. It is, in reality, far more than a dictionary of the Greek Testament; it is a concordance. There are few words, so few that they may be dismissed as entirely unimportant, which are not quoted and explained in every instance of their occurrence in the sacred text. The editor is an American, a professor at Cambridge, Massachusetts. Professor Grimm, of Jena, completed in 1868 a lexicon founded on Wilke's Greek-Latin *Clavis*, which has been acknowledged ever since as holding the first place among Greek Testament lexicons. It is this work which Professor Thayer has here translated, with a few additions of his own (carefully distinguished in the text). Both Grimm and his present editor claim that they have given very great attention to doctrinal terms, without, however, encroaching on the province of the dogmatic theologian. As far as we have been able to examine the enormous volume before us, this claim may be said to be fairly substantiated. We have gone through with some care the elaborate articles on *αἰών*, *πίστις*, *ἰσὺς*, and others, and whilst it is evident that the author and his editor are not always in agreement with Catholic theology and exegesis, in assigning meanings to passages, or classifying significations, it is clear that there is no anti-Catholic bias, and there is an unexpected readiness to acknowledge the existence of dogmatic teaching in the text of the Evangelists and of St. Paul. As a help to the study of the New Testament text, this lexicon will take the place of a multitude of commentators. As an aid to the controversialist it will prove very valuable. In fact, for the English reader, there is nothing like it in existence at present.

Fabiola, or the Church of the Catacombs. By CARDINAL WISEMAN. Illustrated edition. With a Preface by the Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, LL.D. New York, &c. : Benziger Brothers. 1886.

WE have in this well-printed and sumptuously presented edition of "*Fabiola*," a striking tribute to the widespread influence of a book for which its writer certainly did not expect immortality. There are few stories which lend themselves so well to illustration as this tale of the Catacombs; and the completeness with which archæologists have explored the Christian antiquities of Rome has made it easy to fill these pages with woodcuts which are as helpful to the narrative as they are instructive in themselves. Some of the illustrations, it is true, are hardly perhaps accurate in representing the text. For example, when *Fabiola* wounds the slave *Syra*, we have the Roman lady standing up, her right arm raised on high, armed with the style with which she seems about to pierce the very heart of the girl who, on her part, puts out both her arms to save herself, and shrinks to the ground as in mortal dread. The author says: "*(Fabiola)* grasped the style and made an *almost blind* thrust at the *unflinching* handmaid. *Syra* instinctively put forward *her arm*, and received the point, which, *aimed upwards* from the couch, inflicted a deeper gash," &c. (p. 51-2). Moreover, some of the archæological illustrations are slightly erroneous in detail. The "ordination" at p. 32 represents clerics with the clerical *corona*, which certainly did not come into use till the sixth century. We must hasten to say, however, that most of the clerical scenes and groups seem sufficiently correct; and there is such a wealth of pictorial detail that it is not worth while insisting on a few blots where nearly all is so excellent. The print is large and fine, the paper good, the margins wide, and the binding very handsome. We observe with pleasure, in the Rev. Dr. Brennan's preface, the statement that, during the thirty years which have elapsed since it appeared, this touching and most edifying story has brought special blessings to the Church in America. Captious critics may complain that all the characters speak more or less like Cardinal Wiseman. Perhaps they do; even the little fishes, to adapt Goldsmith's phrase, have a tendency to talk like whales. But there is enough vitality in the characters and the incidents to carry off any feeling of stiffness. This edition will make an admirable present or school prize.

The English Parliament in its Transformations through a Thousand Years. By DR. RUDOLPH GNEIST, author of "*The History of the English Constitution.*" Translated by R. JENERY SHEE, of the Inner Temple. London: Grevel & Co. 1886.

"WRITTEN from a German point of view, and intended for the German intellectual world, possessing forms of thought and expression readily appreciable by Germans, but not so wholly within English grasp," Dr. Gneist's book is not likely to attract many

English readers. The introduction, contributed by Professor Hamann, with a view to smoothing the difficulties, does not help us much. He tells us, for instance, that "we need now a pragmatistical explication of the institutions in the living connection of all these reciprocal operations." Nor can the translator, Mr. Shee, be congratulated on the way in which he has performed his difficult task. He has indeed substituted English (and not always English) words for German words, but the original idioms and involved constructions have been retained. In point of style, however, there is little to choose between Mr. Shee's preface, Professor Hamann's introduction, and the body of the work. All are written in that strange dialect used by Germans who have a tolerable knowledge of English. Professor Hamann has already been quoted. The merits of the author and the translator may be estimated from the following passage:

The closing drama of the Stuarts, and of the previous generations have afforded for the life of the nation a gigantic advance in consciousness of knowledge made sure of matters bearing upon the State, and of general human interest. Free understanding, upon which everything depends in the system of a free State, such as the nobility at the time of Magna Charta already possessed, comes back anew in a higher degree in the present generation. In the Cavaliers and in the heroes of the "resistance" in Hobbes, as well as in Locke, is mirrored practical experience in actual State government. It is in the schooling of communal life and its interdependence with Parliament, that is conveyed to the parties, for better and for worse, the understanding of matters of State, and of an actual influence upon the State. It is the habit of communal life, and its morally purifying energy, which repels, from the very foundation upward, all corruption in the State, such as the Court of the Stuarts had spread around. As in earlier periods, however, so in this time so full of strong emotions, a steady improvement of the law has taken its onward course, which, in respect of the further development of the Constitution, fashions the determining groundwork. . . . Regarded as a whole, English society presents, at the close of this period a structure with lordly and dependent points of contact, gently graduated, at the summit, the Peerage as a culminating point of a landed gentry, wider spread and firmly fixed in the country, and of a class of gentlemen still more widely extended; then again, the entire ruling class, with a preponderating influence over the electoral middle-class, the entire portion then held together on the groundwork of equality of property and domestic rights. In this State structure, the foundations of the States were so firmly laid, that the violent acts of Charles I. could not have been perpetrated, and the Puritans, with by without leaving open the door to Revolution, to a Royalist, and Republican, and to a Stuart, as in 1642.

The reader will have noticed that the sentences do not really give out their meaning. But, however, he takes the trouble to read them, and thereby has been enabled to see, and does not object to the use of such words as "groundwork," "preponderant," "dominating," "electoral," "middle-class," "by and without," "a chance and so forth," "be rewarded," "the door is open," "as in 1642," and "to a Stuart, and Republican, and to a Stuart, as in 1642."

P. M. SAMPSON.

Pictorial Bible. Forty Prints, representing the most Memorable Events of the Old and New Testaments. Freiburg (Baden, Germany): B. Herder.

THE prints in this set of Scripture illustrations are on separate sheets, and will serve excellently for the walls of the schoolroom or for putting before a class during instruction. Each picture is about fourteen inches by twelve, and the drawing is bold, and both the colours and the grouping are arranged for effective use at a distance; at the same time they are artistic. Twelve of the sheets belong to the Old, the remaining twenty-eight to the New Testament. The latter are particularly clear and good, designed so as to strike the youthful eye and imagination; the four or five portraying incidents of the Passion being more especially good. For missionary instructions they may be confidently recommended, and also as a very valuable help in teaching Catechism and Scripture history, whether in the school or the nursery.

La Coalition de 1701 contre la France. Par LE MARQUIS DE COURCY, Ancien Diplomate. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1886.

M. LE MARQUIS DE COURCY has given to the world a laborious and prolix account of the Coalition of the Powers against France in 1701, of which the conflict, generally known as the War of the Spanish Succession, was the result. His two volumes are a decided acquisition to an historical library. They contain, as described by the notice which accompanies them, "l'exposé lumineux des événements militaires qui remplirent la triste période de 1700 à 1713, et l'histoire approfondie des traités d'Utrecht et de Rastadt." It might be wished, that this work, so important in itself, were mapped out on a more chronological system. The author ranges backwards and forwards between the years 1701 and 1726, describing each period of time again and again in its different bearings, and interspersing the general history with biographies which extend over the entire career of the actors in his drama; so that the reader is continually meeting anew with personages who seemed to be disposed of for ever several chapters previously. In themselves the biographies are highly interesting; those of Prince Eugène and Marshal Villars are especially so; but they are projected into the midst of the conferences of Rastadt, so that we find the plenipotentiaries disputing over territories and signing treaties long after we have heard their panegyrics pronounced and their wills read.

Notwithstanding some perplexities of arrangement, M. de Courcy, while bringing profound historical research to the treatment of his subject, paints a life-like picture, or rather several successive pictures of that strange old time, that corrupt, painted, affected, vainglorious time, at once so martial and so effeminate, the English phase of which is best known to us through the contemporary pages of the *Spectator*. It was the beginning of the

century, the end of which, for France, was unavoidably the Revolution. The French monarchy in the person of Louis XIV., had risen to so Herod-like a pitch of self-glorification, that its ignominious fall, as might have been foreseen, could not be long delayed, and France—the France, that is, which blazed in the eyes of the world, for the taxed and suffering peasantry were behind the scenes—had grown so proud and so powerful on the strength of many victories, that other nations banded together to stem the tide of her encroachments. Hence half the countries of Europe were set aflame with war by the question whether a Bourbon or a Hapsburg should occupy the throne of Spain, though, indeed, this was not to be the last occasion when a dispute as to the Spanish sovereignty would prove the cause of signal disasters to France. Naturally, Europe was unwilling to see Philip, Duke of Anjou, mount so exalted a throne, however strictly he might profess to renounce the inheritance of Louis XIV., knowing, as Europe knew, how readily the French royal family could discover proofs of the invalidity of such renunciations. But the chief misery of the conflict was that so much of it was fought out in countries only indirectly interested, and by some of the belligerents with the lowest of motives. The Elector of Bavaria, one of the allies of France, “hoped to pay his gambling debts by means of the contribution to be levied on the conquered country,” which happened just then to be the Austrian frontiers of his own State. “Il ne songe qu’à tirer de l’argent des pays conquis pour acquitter ses dettes de jeu” (Villars to Louis XIV., vol. i., p. 31). The war waged on behalf of Philip was unfavourable to France. Excepting Villars, she possessed at that time no general worthy to be opposed to Marlborough and Eugène; the men who had made her fame in the seventeenth century were almost all gone, and none had arisen to replace them. A series of heavy defeats brought her, in the year 1710, to the verge of conquest by the allied powers. Her domestic misery, through an inhuman system of taxation which left the people no means of bearing up against the effect of hard winters and bad seasons, could scarcely have been greater if such a conquest had actually taken place. Disasters multiplied. The quasi-divinity of Louis XIV. was shaken. His own people began to find fault with him and with his ministers; his enemies without seemed to be too powerful for his resources within; the old king recognized the fact that he was neither infallible nor omnipotent, and we agree with M. de Courcy that Louis, in his reverses, is a grander figure than at any other period of his career. Perhaps his remorse and his resignation were a cause of the brightening of his prospects in 1711. At that time the Whig party in England fell; Marlborough was disgraced; Queen Anne withdrew from the European conflict. The frontiers of France were still threatened, but Louis happily selected for their defence Louis Hector de Villars, who, though a terrible gasconader, was dashing, intrepid, and a genius. The victory of Denain or Landrecies (a battle twice fought by M. de Courcy in the course of his work), where the French had the

good fortune to be principally opposed by Dutchmen, and where Eugène came up too late to retrieve the day, effectually barred the "road to Paris." It also enabled Louis XIV. to negotiate with England and Holland a not entirely disadvantageous peace at Utrecht (1713). The Archduke, Philip's rival for the crown of Spain, had now become Emperor, and Europe had no wish to see the monarchy of Charles V. revived by Charles VI.

Striking and even romantic was the attitude of Philip V., the cause of all the embroglio. His grandfather had set him on the Spanish throne, and, curiously enough, there could not have been a truer reproduction of the Spanish Hapsburgs than this last of the Philips. In character he was timid, irresolute, obstinate, scrupulous, at times heroic outwardly; Nature had made him fair-haired and blue-eyed, after the old type. He was devoted to Marie-Louise, his wife, and the two were governed by the Princess Orsini, the *camarera mayor*. M. de Courcy, according to his wont, gives us the history of this remarkable woman, in both his first and second volumes. A typical female French politician, clever, *intrigante*, arrogant, worldly, influential, she sustained Philip and Marie-Louise on their throne when their fortunes were at the lowest ebb, and rose to the apex of grandeur when the tide turned. Though, perhaps, because the Archduke Charles, with the aid of English troops, had conquered a great part of Spain, the Spaniards, with the exception of the Catalonians, preferred the grave, *blond* Bourbon to the warlike, imperious, and far nobler Hapsburg. Also Philip attached himself to the Spaniards, when Louis XIV., whether sincerely or not, invited his grandson to descend from the eminence to which he had raised him, Philip replied like an independent monarch, that his people had chosen him, and that he would abide by them. He did so, though Charles VI., refusing the mediation of the other powers, continued at war with France on his account. It was in Germany that the struggle was carried on. Here Villars took Landau and Fribourg, the latter not without circumstances of great cruelty, and at last the Emperor consented to negotiate. M. de Courcy gives an interesting account of the chivalric meeting and subsequent friendship of the rival generals, Eugène and Villars, deputed to discuss the terms of a peace at the Castle of Rastadt. Their treaty was confirmed at Baden, and by it the Emperor was the chief gainer. He would gladly have engaged Louis to aid him in restoring to the Catholics of Switzerland the liberties wrested from them by their Protestant countrymen; but the fervour of the great king, though it inspired the dragonnades at home, could not push him to an effort abroad, which he conceived to be impolitic.

Philip V., obstinate and impracticable, was not included in the peace, and loudly accused his royal grandsire of betraying his interests, especially in that he had allowed Charles VI. to style himself King of Spain in the protocol. He also demanded as a condition of his making peace, that either the Emperor or the Dutch Republic should bestow a sovereignty on "Madame des

Ursins ; " and pressed her claims with such tiresome iteration as to provoke Louis into declaring that great as was his respect for that lady, he was by no means inclined to make war on her account. What must have been the old King's amusement in 1714, when his grandson acquainted him with the disgrace and exile of the old Princess, whom Philip's second wife, justly disgusted with her airs of tutelage, brusquely dismissed from her presence and from Spain on the very first occasion of their meeting !

To this second wife Philip was a slave ; but she, too, proved to him a goddess of war. Years went by ; the face of Europe was changed ; Anne had been succeeded by George I. in England, Louis XIV. himself had gone the way of all flesh, and still Philip V. and Charles VI. remained unreconciled, each styling himself King of Spain and Emperor of the Indies. The stipulations of the Quadruple Alliance concluded by the Empire, England, Holland, and France, were, it is true, very favourable to Philip, but his only comment was silyly to seize on Sardinia and Sicily. The French themselves invaded his territory, under the command of that very Duke of Berwick who had conquered Barcelona for him ; and at last, in the year 1722, without reference to Paris, he concluded with Charles a peace which put an end to one of the most protracted and miserable of European wars. Thus was a Bourbon firmly established on that throne which was destined to be still occupied by his descendants when the family should have been deposed from every other place of power in Europe.

M. de Courcy is intensely a Frenchman, and a Frenchman of the *ancien régime*. Although some of his expressions with regard to that infamous slayer of souls, Voltaire, and certain other remarks on religious questions, are not altogether what we should expect from a devout Catholic, he yet deplures, as all must do who truly love France, her situation of to-day both as regards her political system and her treatment of the Church. Yet his book might have been expressly written to show how rotten was the condition of Europe in general, and of France in particular, during the eighteenth century, and how rapidly things tended, by their own weight, to revolution and ruin. Could the old State only have been reformed without being destroyed, a truly great work of purification would have taken place, without the substitution of one form of tyranny for another.

The Catholic Directory. 1887. London : Burns & Oates.

THERE is no need of more than the mention that we have received the familiar "Directory" for the New Year. This year's issue goes on the old lines of arrangement—an arrangement which, it must be confessed, is on the whole most satisfactory and easy of consultation. We notice that the diocesan statistics of this year's "Directory" as marking Catholic progress have already afforded matter for paragraphs in the *Times* and other newspapers.

Foremost if I can. (The "Golden Mottoes" Series.) By HELEN ATTERIDGE. With Original Illustrations by GORDON BROWNE. London: Cassell & Company. 1886.

WHEN a book for young folks is decidedly attractive to them, and by no means uninteresting to children of greater growth, it attains a high standard; and we think Miss Atteridge's "*Foremost if I can*" satisfactorily stands this strong test. Its moral is sufficiently enforced without being too didactic. Its characters have marked individuality. Chrissy is charming, and the lads are of the right sort. The scenes from school life are capital. The collie dog, Bounce, who "went under the table to hide his feelings," deserves a word of praise all to himself. "Anything that could be expected of a dog, Bounce could do." The story has both pathos and humour, and is altogether pleasant and readable.

Books of Devotion and Spiritual Reading.

1. *The School of Divine Love.* By Father VINCENT CARAFFA. Translated from the French of MARCEL BOUX, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.
2. *Month of the Souls in Purgatory.* By the Abbé BERLIOUX. Translated from the French by Miss ELEANOR CHOLMELEY. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.
3. *Consolation to those in Suffering.* By the Abbé GUIGOU. Translated from the French. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.
4. *Sister Saint Peter.* By the Abbé JANVIER. Translated by K. A. C. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.
5. *Simple Readings on some of the Parables.* By G. G. G. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.
6. *To-day's Gem for the Casket of Mary from her Congregationalists.* By a member of the Ursuline Community, Thurles. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.
7. *Maxims and Counsels of St. Ignatius Loyola.* Translated from the French by ALICE WILMOT CHETWODE. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.
8. *The Month of the Dead.* By the Abbé CLOQUET. Translated by a Sister of Mercy. New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1887.
9. *The Glories of Divine Grace.* By Dr. M. JOSEPH SCHEEBEN. Translated from the German by a Benedictine Monk. New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1887.

10. *Texts for Children.* By M. A. WARD. London: Burns & Oates.

11. *The Little Rosary of the Sacred Heart.* By MRS. FRANCES BLUNDELL. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.

1. **F**ATHER CARAFFA'S "School of Divine Love," though it hardly perhaps merits the somewhat extravagant eulogy of the writer of the preface to this edition, was assuredly well worth translating. It wants the originality and the decisiveness of a great book, and the chapters are in no ascertainable order, with some amount of repetition. But it is pregnant, effective, and very devotional. A short notice of the author would have been a welcome addition.

2. This translation of one of Abbé Berlioux's devotional manuals advertises itself as appearing "with preface by His Eminence Cardinal Manning." There is doubtless no regulation length for a preface, but it would have been fair, in the present instance, to have let the intending purchaser know that the preface consists of only fourteen lines. It requires some learning to write correctly about purgatory, and also to translate correctly. The "fire" of purgatory is spoken of on p. 22 as "real," yet on the next page is distinguished against "material" fire. No doubt there is a sense in which it is true to speak of a "never-dying worm" of purgatory (p. 32). It is questionable, in these days, whether it does much good to recall the case of the lady who went to purgatory for having "two or three times washed her face through vanity" (p. 49). The book is well translated.

3. If books are ever of any use in consoling one who is really suffering, this translation of a French manual, approved in 1871 by the Bishop of Fréjus, may be recommended. The devout thoughts which it contains will at least lift up the heart from dwelling on mere pain and sorrow, and assist it to unite itself more firmly with God. The paraphrastic way in which texts of Scripture are given, and given between inverted commas, will not be liked; but the translation seems fairly done.

4. A pious and edifying abridgment of the life of Sister St. Peter, a Carmelite of Tours (died 1848), who promoted with great success the devotion to the Holy Face of our Lord, and the work of reparation in France.

5. Explanations, or homiletic improvements, on the parables, are not so easy as some people think. St. Gregory, even, declines to interpret the parable of the Sower, on the ground that Our Lord has interpreted it Himself. The writer of this book interprets it, but without making this graceful reflection. In the parable of Lazarus, "Abraham's bosom" hardly means "eternal bliss" (p. 130). These readings are what they call themselves—simple—and perhaps a trifle too long. To explain every point of a parable is generally to obscure the main lesson. But the book will be useful for the young.

6. The compiler of this pretty little book is honourably known for her persevering labours in devotional literature. She here gives children of Mary a "thought" for every day in the year; and she

draws her maxims and aphorisms from every kind of spiritual writer, from St. Augustine to the "Rev. Father" of her own acquaintance. Each "thought" is followed by a resolution; and each month is specially dedicated to some particular mystery and virtue. The language is good; but such an expression as "get into a temper" is not English, except in the regions of the girls' school-room. One of the resolutions is, "If uncomfortable or inconvenienced, I will silently offer it to God. I will not rest my elbows on the desk." Perhaps the bracketing of a small convent rule with things of greater moment may be apt to give false ideas to children, by confusing their relative estimate of things great and little.

7. A small, but handsomely presented collection of the sayings of St. Ignatius, all of them wonderfully pregnant and helpful. It is remarkable how little they lose by being taken out of their context.

8. Among books on Purgatory this is likely to prove useful. It gives, besides the usual month's considerations and stories, an excellent appendix of Confraternities and Indulgences. It has been approved by many Bishops in France; but it should hardly call itself "approved by the Sacred Congregation." There is more than one Sacred Congregation, and the approval extended to the work by the Congregation of Indulgences only extend to the Indulgences themselves, as appears from the text of the decree.

9. Dr. Scheeben's free rendering of Father Nieremberg's "Glories of Divine Grace" is well translated by a monk of St. Meinrad's Abbey, Indiana. The work itself, to our taste, is neither sufficiently precise and scientific, on the one hand, nor really popular, on the other. Father Nieremberg is a very straggling writer, though his erudition is wonderful. But this translation should be in the hands of every priest and cultivated layman, for we have simply nothing like it. The theology of Grace, apart from one or two abstruse questions, is peculiarly susceptible of being taught to the laity; and this book, which has gone through four editions in German, is an attempt, and by no means an unsuccessful one, to do this.

10. A little book of useful texts for little children; with a page or two of suggestive preface by the Rev. P. Gallwey.

11. The title of this manual rather misrepresents it. It is not exactly the "Rosary of the Sacred Heart," but a useful and pleasing method of practising the Rosary (of our Lady) by meditating on the love of the Sacred Heart as displayed in each mystery. The style seems to be adapted for children; there are perhaps too many "oh's," and too frequent a use of italics for grown-up people. The doctrinal exactness of the book is vouched for by the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Dublin, on the recommendation of Dr. Tynan. We should be inclined to doubt whether it is quite right to say that Our Lord was "teaching" the doctors in the Temple; doubtless he did teach them, but the text says He was "hearing them and asking them questions." It rather jars on one's feelings, moreover, to be told that, in His answer to His Blessed Mother ("How is it that you sought me?") He "expresses surprise" (p. 50). This book will be much liked.

LIST OF BOOKS RECEIVED

(Many of them too late for notice in the present number).

"The Religious Houses of the United Kingdom." Compiled from official sources. London: Burns & Oates.

"The Chief Periods of European History." By E. A. Freeman. M.A., &c. London: Macmillan & Co.

"The Christian Platonists of Alexandria." Bampton Lectures, 1886. By Charles Bigg, D.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

"Mary Stuart: a Narrative of the First Eighteen Years of her Life." Principally from Original Documents. By Rev. Joseph Stevenson, S.J. Edinburgh: William Paterson.

"Ireland and the Celtic Church." By George T. Stokes, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

"Early Letters of Thomas Carlyle." Edited by Charles Eliot Norton. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co.

"Life of Antonio Rosmini Serbati, Founder of the Institute of Charity." Edited by W. Lockhart. Second Edition. Two vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

"A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment." By Roundell Earl of Selborne. London: Macmillan & Co.

"The Ignatian Epistles Entirely Spurious: a Reply to Right Rev. Dr. Lightfoot." By W. D. Killan, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

"Records relating to the Dioceses of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise." By Very Rev. J. Canon Morahan, D.D. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

"The Venerable Bede, Expurgated, Expounded, and Exposed." By the Prig. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

"History of England under Henry IV." By J. H. Wylie, M.A. Vol. I. London: Longmans & Co.

"Monotheism the Primitive Religion of Rome." By Rev. Henry Formby. London: Burns & Oates.

"Christian Apologetics." By J. H. A. Ebrard, Ph.D., D.D. Translated by Rev. Wm. Stuart, B.A., and Rev. J. Macpherson, M.A. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

"The Great Means of Salvation and of Perfection." By St. Alphonsus Liguori. Edited by E. Grimm, C.S.S.R. "The Centenary Edition." Vol. III. "The Mysteries of the Faith." Same Edition, Vol. IV. "The Incarnation." New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. London: R. Washbourne; Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

"Addresses Delivered on Various Occasions." By the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

"Renaissance in Italy.—The Catholic Reaction." Two vols. By John Addington Symonds. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

"Sir Philip Sidney." By J. A. Symonds. London: Macmillan & Co.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL 1887.

ART. I.—CHURCH EXTENSION AND ANGLICAN EXPANSION.

THE extension or expansion of Christianity is a phrase which had formerly, in every part of Christendom, and still has wherever the Catholic religion prevails, a perfectly definite meaning. It meant an enlargement of that *leavened* portion of the human family which had heard and accepted the message from Heaven revealed through Jesus Christ eighteen centuries ago. It meant that the one tree, the Church, sprung from the one grain of mustard-seed, the Christian doctrine, was putting forth fresh leaves and boughs, for which union with the parent stem was life, and separation was death. If meant the progressive execution of the last commission given by the Redeemer to His chosen servants, "Going into all the world, preach the Gospel to every creature." Unitarians tell us that, soon after their Master had left them, his disciples commenced a series of insoluble inquiries about his Person,* and that thence have come all the troubles of Christendom. But what else could they do than face each doubt as it arose, probe each question to the bottom as it presented itself, so that they might be sure that they were still holding *the same* Gospel, and believing it rationally and rightly as at the first. They did so; and thus a Catholic creed and ultimately a Christian philosophy were framed. A "Holy Catholic Church" was the communion of all holding this true creed. The bounds of Christendom were extended when *it*, and nothing else, was believed in by fresh neophytes. All the nations of Europe were gradually taught this same Gospel, and brought within one and the same pale. The Church prays to this day that as "blessed Stephen"—king

* Dr. Martineau's article, *Contemporary Review*, July, 1886, p. 11.

in Hungary nearly nine hundred years ago—"was her *extender* while reigning on earth, so she may deserve to have him as her glorious defender in the heavens." She would not pray so, were she not certain that the faith which Stephen upheld and propagated was identically the same with that which she holds now.

A short catena of passages from Christian writers of the first four centuries will place this doctrine of the essential oneness of Christianity in a clear light :

"One body and one Spirit ; . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism." (Eph. iv. 4, 5.)

"Why are there strifes, and passions, and dissensions, and schisms, and war amongst you? Have we not one God and one Christ? is there not one Spirit of grace poured out upon us, and one calling in Christ?" (Clement of Rome, 1 *Ad Cor.* 46.)

"From the fact that such men are found, who, while they declare themselves to be Christians, and confess Jesus who was crucified as both Lord and Christ, do not teach his doctrines, but those which come from the spirits of error, we, the disciples of the genuine and pure teaching of Jesus Christ, become more faithful and firm in the hope announced by him." (Justin Martyr, *Dialog.* 35.) Mr. Holland, in his admirable article on Justin in the Dictionary of Christian Biography, says, "He [Justin] knows quite clearly how true believers stand towards [heretics] ; there is a definite line."

"He who breaks the peace and concord of Christ, is opposing Christ (*adversum Christum facit*). . . . And does any one believe that this unity, coming from the divine steadfastness, and cemented by heavenly sacraments, can be broken in the Church, and sundered by the conflict of clashing wills? He who holds not this unity holds not the law of God—holds not the faith of the Father and the Son—holds not life and salvation." (Cyprian, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 6.)

In the third chapter of the same work Cyprian says, that the devil "invented heresies and schisms, whereby he might subvert the faith, corrupt the truth, and sever unity."

"It is certain that all the prophets foretold concerning Christ that the time should come when one, born of the race of David according to the flesh, should establish for God's honour an eternal temple, which is called the Church, and should summon all the nations to the true religion of God. This is the faithful house, this the immortal temple, in which whosoever sacrifices not wins not the reward of immortality." (Lactantius, *Divin. Instit.* iv. 14.)

"It is therefore the Catholic Church alone which retains the true worship. This is the fountain of truth, this the home of faith, this the temple of God ; into which if a man does not enter, and from which if a man departs, he is a stranger to the hope of life and of everlasting salvation." (*Ib.* c. 30.)

That the chain of which a few links have here been brought into sight has never been broken, that there has been no breach

in the continuity of this kind of testimony, few honest and well-informed adversaries of Catholicism will venture to deny. Embarrassing disputes have arisen in past times as to the precise residence of that infallible authority in deciding controversies which all genuine Catholics admit to be one of the Church's attributes; but sooner or later the question has always been decided, and though the decision may have left malcontents and a schism, the one Church and the one faith remained as they were before. As the latest manifestation of this uniform spirit may be cited the instructions accompanying the promulgation of the Jubilee of last year (1886), in which Leo XIII. directs all Christians to pray "for the uprooting of heresies and the conversion of all who are in error."

With this view of the extension of the Christian religion it is interesting to compare some opinions on the "expansion of the Church of England," which emerged at a "Church Reform Conference," held in March last year. Sir George W. Cox, the rector of a Yorkshire living, moved a resolution to the effect that the only way for the Church of England to "vindicate her comprehensive name" was to take steps in order to embrace "the whole Christian thought and life of the nation," and that to this end, the entire abolition of clerical subscription, and the repeal of the Acts of Uniformity, were measures of primary importance and necessity. Dr. Martineau, the celebrated Unitarian writer, seconded the resolution, and it was carried. Since then, the mover and seconder have both unfolded their views and aims in the pages of the *Contemporary Review*,* and Dr. Martineau has further explained himself in a lucid and forcible letter to the *Guardian*.†

Although they can agree upon a resolution, there is no real unison of opinion between the Anglican and the Unitarian. Sir George Cox is evidently alarmed at the progress and power of the Nonconformists; the persistent attacks of the Liberation Society—the pledge taken by so many Liberal candidates at the last general election but one, that they would support some measure of Disestablishment—fill him with anxiety for the future. He looks round to see what portion of her cargo can be thrown overboard to lighten the ship. Previous sacrifices have left the dogmatic burden light enough; but there is still something that may go. In 1865, in pursuance of the report of a Commission issued under the Great Seal, there was substituted for the old subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, which all persons taking orders in the Established Church had till then been bound to, "a simple declaration of general approval

* June and July, 1886.

† August 18, 1886.

of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.”* This is not very onerous; still it would keep out a conscientious Unitarian or Baptist, to say nothing of Atheists or Agnostics; and therefore Sir George Cox, whose principle is that the patrons of livings should be absolutely unfettered, would sweep the restriction away. He would also repeal the Act of Uniformity, by which the Anglican clergy are restricted to the use of the liturgy contained in the Prayer Book. Hitherto, he considers, “the downfall of barrier after barrier has only extended her [the Church’s] influence;” “the removal of every test has only rendered her action more beneficent.” Take away the small remnant of dogmatic limitation that still exists, and the most cheering results would immediately follow. Nonconformist ministers—and, he might have added, Agnostic and Positivist lecturers—“will at once become eligible for Church preferment” (p. 844). “The so-called Nonconformist bodies would thus, like the great orders and companies of Latin Christendom, become religious associations within the National Church.” This delightful absorption would of course exactly meet the views and satisfy the ardent longings of Mr. Spurgeon, the Rev. Newman Hall, and the Rev. Dr. Parker of the City Temple. Sir George Cox thinks that, apparently in gratitude for these amazing concessions from their old persecutor, the Dissenters would immediately begin to make large use of the Prayer Book in their public devotions. But there are many sects that have never been persecuted, and, though they are free to use the Prayer Book if they choose, they show no inclination to do so. “Shall the Church go on as she is,” asks Sir George, or shall she “open her arms and embrace all who profess and call themselves Christians?” Some of us know at least one communion that would reject the false caress. Sir George claims to be “in absolute agreement with those illustrious men, Maurice and Arthur Penrhyn Stanley.” Whether, in the case of Maurice, he understands *le dernier mot de l’énigme*, may well be doubted. For Maurice, in a passage here cited (p. 839), desired the abolition of subscription “in the hope that the value and authority of the Articles would thus come to be more widely felt and acknowledged.” If then he had at any time been led to think less favourably of the Articles, he would, one may infer, have desired the re-imposition of subscription. As to Arthur Stanley, my ever dear and honoured tutor in years gone by, Sir George certainly misconceives his position. Stanley, though he had no confidence in the English Church, placed great reliance on the English State. Ecclesiastical decisions as to what was Anglican

* *Contemporary Review*, vol. xli. p. 839.

doctrine would be, he thought, swayed by clamour, and vitiated by party heats; but to legal decisions on the same points, uttered in the calm atmosphere of a court of law, which was the immediate organ of the State, he was ever ready to bow. He subscribed to the Voysey fund; but he told Mr. Voysey that he only did so pending the judicial decision of the question whether his published views were compatible or incompatible with office-bearing in the Church of England; and, when the courts decided that they were incompatible, the Dean walked with Mr. Voysey no more. But Sir George Cox's "reforms" would put it out of the power of the law courts, equally with the Convocation, to adjudge any given opinion, however foolish or harmful, to be incompatible with office-bearing in the Church of England. This is not Stanley's view, but very far remote from it.

Dr. Martineau's motives for seconding the resolution must have been widely different. He looks upon the Establishment from without, Sir George from within. The latter is like the beaver in the fable, which bites off his tail and leaves it on the ground, hoping that his pursuers will take it, and allow the rest of him to get safely away. If the Dissenters, thinks Sir George, saw their way to a good share in the benefices and other good things in the Church, their disestablishing and disendowing rage would be appeased, and they would be content to leave things much as they are. A loftier aim and profounder calculations actuate the Unitarian thinker. In the first place he realizes and duly appreciates the greatness, the splendour of the intellectual triumph, which the official abandonment by the Church of England of all distinctive Christian doctrine would give to its old adversaries:—"We always told you so; we said you were too sure; we protested against your imposing upon Englishmen scholastic subtleties as if they were demonstrated certainties. Now you have come round; we remain what we were; you have descended to our level." Such, whether tacit or expressed, would be the feeling in the Unitarian camp when the surrender was consummated; and no one can say that it would be unreasonable. Again, the social "levelling up" which would ensue when the law made no difference between conformist and Nonconformist, and eminent ministers among the latter, duly nominated by patrons, were seen to pass freely into the benefices and stalls of the Establishment—while, to a man of Dr. Martineau's elevated character, it would be a matter of no personal importance—would be welcomed even by him for the sake of the satisfaction it would breed in the breasts of his allies. Of far greater value and utility in his eyes would be the practical avowal that orthodox belief was not worth enforcing;

because it would justify a sanguine anticipation of an ultimate general lowering of the religious temperature of the country down to the point of psilanthropist refrigeration. *Ultimate*—for Dr. Martineau is too wise to precipitate matters. It was far from his thought, he says,* to impose a common, colourless, undogmatic Christianity upon all who should be embraced within the National Church. He would have the Anglican retain his Thirty-nine Articles, and even his sacerdotal pretensions; let the Wesleyan Methodist be Arminian still, and the Whitfieldian Methodist Calvinistic still. Only let them all, peaceably living and working side by side, nourish a “federal sympathy,” let them keep alive within them a reserve of enthusiasm for the parti-coloured and heterogeneous body of which “expansion” had made them members. Dr. Martineau sees that the Unitarians, if thus brought into communion with the much larger Protestant bodies that believe in Christ as the Son of God, would gain everything and sacrifice nothing. Those with whom they were confederated would believe all that the Unitarians believe—for all hold that Christ was true man, and that “never man spoke like this man”—only they would believe a great deal more. That which was *common* to the banded tribes of what Dr. Martineau calls “English Christendom” would be simple Unitarianism. Certain *plus* quantities, greater or smaller, would represent the excess of the faith of the other confederates over this psilanthropist residuum. These excesses the newly admitted Unitarians, to whom all the doors of preferment were now legally open, would regard with perfect philosophical composure. In their eyes they would be baseless superstitions, connected indeed with much that was powerful and beautiful in the past, but certain to drop off and vanish sooner or later in the swelling tide of knowledge and modern civilization.†

* See his interesting letter to the *Guardian*, cited above.

† Pretty, however, as this theory looks, there seems a certain lack of historical imagination in the man who could deem it capable of being realized. So James II. and Father Petre supposed that the Anglican clergy and people could be persuaded or browbeaten into acquiescence in the tenure of a portion of the endowments by Catholics; but they found out their mistake. It would be like a company with a capital of twenty thousand shares, the affairs of which were so arranged that nine-tenths of the advantages of the partnership went to the holder of a single share. In Dr. Martineau’s imaginary form of English Christendom, the one share represents the psilanthropist or Unitarian doctrine, while nearly all the other shares represent the theanthropist or Christian doctrine. When this became evident, it may be safely predicted—human nature remaining what it is—that either some new regulation would be adopted by the majority, tending to restore the preponderance to their own doctrine, and to make things difficult for the holders of the other, or, if the law prevented this, there would be a split and a readjustment.

It is desirable to consider the matter more closely, for Dr. Martineau is the master of a fascinating style, and yet he is advocating as pestilent a fallacy as heresy ever put forward. To suppose him indifferent to truth would be to do him injustice; but he has persuaded himself that truth in religion is an affair of theosophy and mysticism, not of theology. A quiet, spiritual temper, an ideal elevation of thought, a habit of contemplating that Infinite which transcends definition and defies analysis, these seem to him to be the characteristics of the genuinely religious man, and to be outside of all formal religious systems. This is in his eyes that which is beautiful—inward—tending to perfection; this element is alone precious; the special intellectual furniture of each religion comparatively worthless. The end of a church he deems to be “the sanctification of human life by conscious communion with the infinitely perfect spirit, and the consequent enthusiasm of all pure and uniting affections.” * “Wander where you will,” he says, “through the interior of this or that communion, you will come across essentially the same humility and elevation of spirit, the same tender self-forgetfulness, the same composure and steadfastness of trust, the same refinement, not of culture but of simplicity, not of acquired knowledge but of ideal habit, which ever reappear in the genuinely Christian type of mind.” How charmingly is this expressed! and there is of course a modicum of truth in it, which goes far to explain the persistent *self-complacency* of religious error. Mysticism springs up everywhere in the soil of human nature. The darkness out of which we came, and towards which we hasten; the soliciting, haunting problem of personal identity; the impossibility of conceiving, and yet the equal impossibility of not believing, the boundlessness of space, the impulses and thrills that rush unbidden across the consciousness; the ravishment which the sense of beauty raises; here is ample material for a serious contemplative spirit, be its religious history what it may. There are mystics among the Mahometans, among the Hindoos, among the Buddhists. The late Mahdi was a thorough mystic; living in solitude, and practising great austerity, he communed for many years with the soul of things, and this was doubtless in great part the cause of his extraordinary influence over the Arabs. But when he descended from the heights of contemplation into the world of action, it did not appear that he was morally any the better for his mysticism. He acted like other Mahometans; he married four wives, he kept slaves, he was ambitious—perhaps cruel. One of Wesley’s most trusted lieutenants, Westley Hall, a man who was supposed to have been delivered from the

* *Contemporary Review*, July, 1886, p. 7.

"legal night" * of the unconverted, and born again into the liberty of the saints, turned out a heartless and shameless profligate.† Nor does the mysticism of Buddhist monks—if the reports of travellers may be believed—preserve them from a large share of moral delinquency. Mysticism, like science, is neutral ground. A nature noble and unselfish to begin with may erect its scientific convictions into a kind of religion, and sincerely believe that if European society would embrace them, and forsake the Christian creed, all would be well. A different nature, selfish and unloving, may use those same scientific convictions as a justification for emancipating itself from the control of morality, and making its superior knowledge the lever for personal advancement.‡ Even so, this mystical theosophy, which Dr. Martineau regards as the common ground on which Catholic saints, and good men of other communions meet, although in many of these last it may wear a gracious and winning outside, and add a charm to that moral rectitude which they drew from other sources, still cannot be "trusted home," because it is not based on that principle of Christian humility which alone makes mysticism safe. St. Teresa was often rapt in contemplation "to the third heaven;" but this did not make her feel herself exempt from ordinary rules, or untouched by the duty of obedience. "She knew them [her visions and raptures] to be subordinate to the ordinary means which God has established to conduct our souls to Him, and as all pretended visions must be false and condemned which should contradict the Scripture, or the authority of the Church, so no such visions can exempt us from any duty towards the Church or others; for God never derogates by private revelations from his general laws and established rules." § Needless to say that in her, and in other cases, this obedience appears to have been rewarded, so far as ordinary persons can judge of such high matters, by heavenly favours to which the experience of non-Catholic mystics offers hardly anything parallel. ||

Conscious of the weak point in Dr. Martineau's reconciling theory, the *Guardian*, in replying to his letter, suggests that

* Wesley's lines on his mother :

"True daughter of affliction she,
Inured to pain and misery;
Mourned a long night of griefs and fears,
A *legal night* of seventy years."

† See Tyerman's "Life of Wesley," vol. i.

‡ This is the moral of that remarkable book, "La Morte," by Octave Feuillet.

§ Alban Butler, Oct. 15.

|| Only a fanatic could regard Swedenborg's alleged revelations, for instance, as anything else than the subjective shapings of a lively imagination. See the chapters on the Swedish hierophant in Möhler's "Symbolik."

he is ignoring the authority of the "Holy Catholic Church." Such words have indeed no distinct meaning in the mouth of an Anglican; but they betray a dim apprehension of the truth that God has a twofold manner of dealing with souls, which He will exalt, if they deserve it, to extraordinary heights of love and union, while never releasing them from the duty of obedience to the lawful pastors and rulers of His kingdom on earth.

Men may differ as to the consequences to which the inclusion of "extreme incompatibilities" within the National Church would lead in the future, but there cannot be much dispute as to the results which would have flowed from such a proceeding in the past. Our forefathers, during the nine centuries that followed the landing of St. Augustine on Thanet, may have been unenlightened; they may have vainly aimed at the possession of truth and certainty, while they should have been content with the enjoyment in mutual tolerance of uncertain opinions; but taking them as they were, the expansion now recommended would surely have had disastrous results. Let us begin from the beginning. In the seventh century there was a strenuous controversy in the rising English Church as to the right observance of Easter. The missionaries from Iona had introduced one way, those from Rome another. Thus, in one of the northern courts, the king and queen kept Easter on different days. The authority of St. John was quoted for one practice, that of St. Peter for the other. Here was an opportunity for mutual forbearance—for the toleration of divergent views—for expansion by comprehension! The typical Anglican of post-Reformation times, supported so far by Unitarians like Dr. Martineau, and indeed by all other sectaries, would be much too proud, under the like circumstances, to bow to Roman or any other authority. Self-respect, he would think, and national dignity, demanded the unflinching maintenance of a position or principle once taken up. Our forefathers judged differently. Although no doctrine was involved, this observance of Easter was a matter of high practical importance; it was necessary, therefore, if possible, to obtain a decision of the universal Church respecting it. The Pope, as pastor and ruler of the whole Church,* was recognized by them as entitled to formulate such a decision. The Pope decided; those of the other way of thinking gradually submitted; and all England consented to observe Easter in the Roman way. Such submission, from the point of view of Anglicans and Dr. Martineau, was tame, slavish, pusillanimous. But let us consider what would have

* Abbot Huætbert, writing to Gregory II. in 716, thanks the Lord, "quod te nostris temporibus. . . . regimini totius Ecclesiæ præficere dignatus est!"—BEDA, *Hist. Abbatum*.

happened if our forefathers had behaved with that proper manly independence which Anglicans and Unitarians recommend. In that case the Christians of England would have formed, when the Normans came over, at least two separate bodies. But they would probably have been split by that time into several more; for, if the authority of the Holy See might rightly be set at nought on one point, it might rightly be set at nought on another. It was debated in the same century whether there was a single or a twofold will in Christ. Pope Agatho, in union with the Eastern Church, decided at the Sixth General Council (680) that there were two wills in Christ, one human, the other divine. It is, however, an intricate and difficult question; and nothing could be easier than to find plausible arguments in support of Monothelitism. Had our forefathers been thinking mainly of their own dignity, and been bent on repelling the slightest lesion or abrasion on the panoply of their spiritual pride, those of them who favoured Monothelitism would have continued to do so, regardless of the condemnation of Rome. Similarly, the Adoptionism of the eighth century, and the Iconoclasm of the ninth, might easily, if the Anglican or Unitarian temper had then prevailed, have become embodied in distinct sects—"flourishing Churches," as a Methodist would say. The general result would have been that when the Normans came over, instead of finding, as they did, the whole English nation rooted in the same faith and enrolled in the same Church with themselves, they would have seen with amazement and disgust a people sundered on various pleas, through their own stiff-necked pride, from the visible centre of unity, and disqualified from worshipping along with them at the Catholic altar. How this would have worked is no matter of conjecture; a bitter experience is at hand to enlighten us. The Catholic Irish, in the three centuries that have passed since the English abandoned the unity of the Church, instead of drawing nearer to their Protestant neighbours, have moved further away from them; war, open or veiled, revolt, and repression have filled the mournful pages of Irish history. Whatever other causes of estrangement are or have been at work, those who know Ireland well confess that the difference of religion is the one insurmountable barrier which prevents her from being anglicized like Wales—the one unmanageable element which renders all schemes for unification and reconciliation uncertain. Had the English of the eleventh century been such in religion as they are in the nineteenth, that intimate blending, which in a couple of hundred years fused them and the Normans into one people, could never have taken place. At this day Great Britain would be either a monarchy without checks, or a bundle of small weak

States. It is worth while to examine more closely the actual process by which the Anglo-Norman fusion was effected, for in this way the uniting and reconciling force of community in religion will be more easily understood.

The influence of woman in social and family life is disputed by none; but it must be remembered that it *is* influence, and not direct control or command. It is the men who settle on what lines the faith and action of the family shall be conducted; and the women who, keeping within those lines, modify the general result through their power in the realm of feeling. What son is he, whom tender thoughts of a dead or absent mother do not, at times animate, at times restrain? So the critical or loving eye of a sister influences a brother; and the husband thinks of what will please the wife of his youth. Still it is the men who decide what shall be the religion of the State or the family; and the women follow their lead. When it is a question of embracing Catholicism, it is the men who first renounce idolatry; when it is a question of falling away from Catholicism, it is the men who, either as rebels or as cowards, take the lead in desertion. There is something very melancholy in this thought, for, since women are more conscientious than men, and less under the influence of selfish hopes and fears, it is certain that, if it rested with them, no Catholic people would ever break away from the unity of the Church. Proportionate to the tenderness of the female conscience must be the keenness of the distress felt by women, when their male guardians and companions fall away from the faith in which they have been reared. Nor are instances wanting of stubborn fidelity to their religion on the part of women, even after their male kindred had abandoned it. Such cases are, however, rare; in times of religious change, the issues of stability and apostacy are usually so far confused, that persons of ordinary discernment and average character may be honestly in doubt what course to take. At such times women naturally throw the responsibility of deciding upon men. Sir Thomas More preferred to die rather than allow to the Sovereign a religious authority which, he was convinced, resided of right in the Holy See; but his wife, intimidated by the general consent of male society to the king's proceedings, would have been better pleased if the head of the house had proved more compliant. The change having been once effected in spite of them, women, who are born conservatives, cling to the new creed with no less tenacity than they adhered to the old. Supernal intelligences might well behold with a sad and pitying wonder the eager fidelity with which the countrywomen and descendants of ancient saints support, in England the schism of Cranmer—in Syria, the doctrines of Mohammed. And although,

as has been said, women would never have initiated a revolt from Catholicism, it is certain that, the revolt having been once nationally consummated, an immense dead weight of female influence is always tending to prevent a return towards right belief. Men—dislodged far oftener by the influences of the time from the religious notions of childhood—would in many cases, reason and grace aiding, be glad to break away and breathe the *largior æther* of Catholicism ; but their wives and daughters, having never experienced a similar dislodgment, usually oppose all such returns and relentings with their whole strength. The tide of social and educational influences being in their favour, they often “save,” as they say, the younger members of the family, even if the elders prove intractable.

The object of this examination of female influence has been to point to the conclusion that whereas, given the close contact of two populations professing different religions, the power of woman in the household tends to accentuate and envenom the differences ; the same power, given the close contact of two populations professing the *same* religion, tends to the speedy obliteration of all differences less vital in character, and to the fusion of the two races into one. This was what happened in England after the Conquest. The Normans of those days, though often ambitious, hard, and practically unscrupulous, really believed in their religion ; and, if the English maidens whom they wedded had been of a different faith, the confusion and bitterness introduced into domestic life would have been endless. Happily it was otherwise ; the husband in every such case knew that no Norman damsel would train up his children in the sweetness and liberty of the Catholic creed more strictly and piously than his English wife ; and on all this chapter of human life his mind was at rest. Similarly, the bride entered hopefully into such a marriage, knowing that in proportion as she and her husband took life more seriously, the agreement and sympathy between them—their religious ideas being the same—could not but become more close. There were no twice-celebrated marriages in those days ; no disputes about the christening of children ; no separate graveyards ; no “you go your way and I will go mine.” If a church were to be built, a convent founded, a friar supported, husband, wife, and children were all alike interested. Everywhere conscience was at ease ; the woman’s heart was satisfied ; and soon an inextricable network of blessed family affections overspread the land, paving the way for that union of languages, social activities, and political interests which soon followed.

With Irish Catholics, this “expansion” of the Church of England, though carried out to the utmost hope of its promoters, would do absolutely nothing towards softening anti-

English feeling. To the Americanized portion of them, Englishmen are hateful as Englishmen, whether their religion be good or bad : to the majority, so long as they were not Catholics, their neighbours would be no nearer or dearer to them than before. In Catholic countries, and in lands where the Greek Church prevails, the difficulty of knowing what an Englishman's religion is, or whether he has any religion at all, would certainly not be diminished. That, however, is a matter for Anglicans to consider.

Two things have now been shown. First, that the method by which Europe—and one might add Persia, Syria, Asia Minor, and North Africa—actually became Christian, far from being one of compromise, toleration of differences, inclusion of incompatibilities, and the like, was one of sharp and vigilant definition, with exclusion of all alien elements. Secondly, it has been made clear, from the history of our own island, that this uncompromising method, instead of being the source of division, was the chief means under Providence, at a period when an alien race, speaking a foreign tongue, had rudely seized the government of the country, and the danger of an estrangement between the conquerors and the conquered was very great, of healing the breach, assuaging the bitterness of subjugation, and finally bringing about that complete union of English and Normans, the benefits of which we enjoy to this day. From this palmary instance an inference is of course suggested, that what is wanted for the improvement of our national condition is not the co-presence of many religious systems—unlike, but mutually tolerant—but the sincere and general acceptance of one religious system.

Thus much many who are not Catholics would be ready to admit; but they would feel that the admission did not take them far, because such a general acceptance of any one system appears in modern times to be impracticable. Supposing it to be granted, they would say, that *if* the Catholic religion were true, the behaviour of its defenders in allowing of no compromise, and condemning every opposing doctrine, would be natural and right; we are as far as ever from the conclusion that the Catholic religion *is* true. You say it is true, we say it is false. Who is to decide? If you appeal to texts of Scripture, we say that you interpret them wrongly; you say the same of us. Where is the judge of appeal? Will you name the Pope? But we reject his claims. A General Council? But we could never agree on the terms of convening; and even if that were possible, we should not think ourselves bound by its decisions, if adverse.*

* For, (Article XXI.), General Councils "may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God."

It is quite true, Catholics might reply, that the doctrine of the Church cannot be proved by Scripture alone, when those against whom it is urged dispute our interpretation and no court of appeal can be devised which both sides would recognize. We say that the meaning of Scripture is proved by the Church; and if you disallow the proving authority, we cannot bring the matter to a conclusion by pressing you with texts: that would be merely arguing in a circle; but we say that you ought to accept the authority of the Church because it is proved by her "notes," borne out by Scripture, by her history, and by miracles; and to plain common-sense and honesty a miracle at least should be an unanswerable argument.

This proposition—that the Church is partly proved by miracles—is one which those outside her pale are accustomed rather to evade or deride than to combat directly. Few genuine Protestants would deny that if the Church could produce among her credentials such miracles as those recorded in the New Testament, they would have great evidential weight; but they commonly think that even if some of the ecclesiastical miracles appear to be backed by strong testimony, they differ in some essential feature from those related in the Bible, and prove, even if true, little or nothing. Agnostics take a bolder line. Miracles, they say, do not occur; they were believed in when the world was in a different temper; they belong to a different stage of civilization. Well, in a limited sense this is true. Cardinal Newman says somewhere, that if a miracle were reported to him as having been performed by an Anglican bishop, or a Presbyterian elder, he should "repudiate the notion." By such persons, and among such persons, no miracles could be expected to be performed, and accordingly none "occur." Miracles are gracious manifestations of divine power and love, modifying the ordinary co-existences and successions of phenomena, in reward of faith or in answer to prayer. They occur among those, and only those, who practise faith and obedience towards the God of nature and of grace. Anglicans may in a limited sense possess faith; but their minds are so pre-occupied with the notion of a sturdy independence in religion, that it is scarcely possible for them to practise obedience in the Christian sense; and therefore to expect that miracles should occur among them would be unreasonable. They obey the State in the things of religion; they render to Cæsar the things that are God's. The Presbyterian does not indeed obey the State; but he obeys his own opinion, or his leader, or his synod; and that is equally bad. Still more unreasonable would it be to expect a miracle to occur among the urban throngs—the materialized bourgeoisie and proletariat—the "average Byzantines" of modern civilization. Civilization teaches us to rely,

for all that concerns the conservation and improvement of mind and body, on training, experiment, observation, and calculation. It deals with averages, with ordinary experience, with physical law. The results, especially when men are considered in masses, are held to be so satisfactory, that the sect of Positivists discern in its development the materials for the construction of a new theory of Providence, which they hope may replace the habit of looking above the clouds or beyond the grave. The sect is not yet entirely successful; nor of course does reason in any way prescribe that, while studying and availing ourselves of what are called the laws of nature, we should ignore the possibility of their being modified in any given case by that higher force to which believers give the name of God. Still, owing to the limited capacity of the human mind, a sustained absorption in any one set of conceptions tends to throw conceptions of a different order out of sight; and hence the spoiled children of civilization—in all the centres of European and American life—have unlearned the old doctrine of a humble dependence, when all is done, on Divine Providence. In other words, they are a populace in the midst of which a miracle is most unlikely to occur.

But, after all, it is rather a hazardous assertion to say that miracles have never occurred. The difficulty of proving a negative is proverbial. Think of the seventy volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*, containing the particulars of many thousands of miracles, a large proportion of which are supported by what looks like evidence at first hand. Consider the local records of a score of Catholic shrines, which have burst into notoriety within the last fifty years, each with its tale of miraculous occurrences, vouched for often by the testimony of persons still living. Consider also that the assumption of the non-occurrence of miracles would leave many historical problems much more difficult of solution than they are on the contrary assumption. For instance, the rapid spread of Christianity among the Angles and Saxons in the seventh century becomes tolerably conceivable if we allow the miracles, which, according to Beda, accompanied that conversion, to have really happened. If they did not happen, then the Catholic converters of England stood, so far, on the same ground as the Protestant missionaries who have laboured for the last two hundred years in India. These last have certainly worked no miracles, and their success in converting the natives has been exceedingly small. How was it that the Augustines and the Wilfrids, if they worked no miracles, were so incomparably more successful? It will be said perhaps that their hearers were more credulous; that, although miracles did not really happen, our forefathers believed that they happened, and so the effect was the same. But are there no credulous or superstitious races in India?

The amiable and gifted Heber, the earnest Swartz, the enthusiastic Carey, would have found thousands ready to welcome and own them as Thaumaturgi, had the smallest shred of fact been producible in that direction. Nor is it the fact that our forefathers were at any time fanciful, imaginative, and prone to credulity. To take a later age—the Host, the Merchant, the Lawyer, the Wife of Bath, in Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales," represent classes of which the representatives abound in the Protestant England of to-day. They were business-like, ready-witted, short and sharp in manner, much as English people are now: they laughed at a lying cozening pardoner, as we laugh at "Mr. Sludge the medium." If they believed that sick people were sometimes healed at the shrine of St. Thomas,* it is probable that they had solid and sufficient grounds for such a belief. It is indeed unquestionable that nothing would induce their Protestant descendants to believe that anything similar had ever happened or could happen at the tomb of an Anglican bishop. But the reason of the difference does not lie in the English laity, whose temperament is but little changed; it lies in the altered condition of the English clergy—then in free and living communion with the Universal Church, and with the See of Peter—now cut off from such communion, and bound by the *lex loci* without appeal.

To illustrate the nature of the problem, and show how robust and omnivorous a scepticism is required to reject all miraculous stories *in globo*, I have selected from various periods of Church history a few of those which come to us with strong evidence in support of their truth. I am tempted to begin with St. Martin of Tours, the marvels of whose life are recorded by his disciple, Sulpicius Severus; but it seems more suitable to the narrow limits of this sketch to commence from St. Augustine of Hippo (A.D. 354–431).

A well-known chapter of "De Civitate Dei" (Book xxii. ch. 8) is headed "Concerning the miracles which happened that the world might believe in Christ, and do not cease to happen, now that the world believes." Particulars are given of twenty-three events, in which persons believed to be dead had suddenly revived, diseases were suddenly and permanently cured, or evil spirits expelled. These events are all assigned either to Hippo itself, the town where Augustine lived, or to places in the district surrounding Hippo. Many of them, however, could not at this distance of time be appealed to in proof of anything, because Augustine (who through all this chapter is studying brevity, that

* "The holy blissful martyr for to seke,
That hem hath holpen, whan that thei were sick."
Can. Tales, Prol.

he may hasten on to the end of his work) does not mention on what authority he relates them. It seems highly probable that in each case he had the authority either of some one personally cognizant of the facts, or of one of those *libelli* or written statements which it was customary, he says, to send in to the bishop when a miracle had happened. But nothing of this kind is expressly mentioned, and therefore if any one chooses to surmise that St. Augustine is here relying on popular rumour only, it is impossible to prove the contrary. But several of these miracles rest upon evidence the nature of which is specified. First, he relates, apparently as an eye-witness, briefly here, but more fully in his "Confessions" (Book ix. ch. 7), the recovery of sight at Milan by a man who had been blind many years, through the application of a handkerchief which had touched the bier carrying the freshly discovered relics of the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius. This happened, he says, under the eyes of the emperor (Valentinian II.) and an immense multitude of people; it was in the year 386. St. Ambrose (Ep. 22) mentions the same miracle, and gives the man's name. There is a slight difference, however; according to his account, it was upon touching a strip (*fimbria*) of the clothing which covered the martyrs' bodies, that Severus recovered his sight. Paulinus, a notary, sending to St. Augustine, after the death of Ambrose, a short biography of his great patron, also refers to the miracle, and adds an interesting circumstance. "A blind man named Severus, *who to this day is a faithful minister of the Church in the same basilica*—that named the Ambrosian—upon touching the clothing of the martyrs, immediately recovered his sight."

The next miracle that Augustine mentions had also been witnessed by himself: "nos interfuimus et oculis aspeximus nostris." It was the cure of fistula, in response to very earnest prayer, in the case of Innocentius, an ex-advocate, living at Carthage. Then he mentions the case of a lady named Innocentia, also of Carthage, cured of cancer by a woman just baptized making the sign of the cross over the place; the lady herself told him the whole story. So when a man at Curubis was cured of paralysis and another malady at the moment of receiving baptism, Augustine says that he caused him to come in from Curubis to Carthage, and implies that he heard all the details from his own mouth. The cure of Paulus and Palladia was also witnessed by Augustine himself, but the complaint seems to have been nervous, and its disappearance might possibly have been due to natural causes.

All through this chapter St. Augustine is lamenting that the miraculous events which he describes were known each within a very narrow circle, unlike the Gospel miracles, which, being read

in the churches, were known to all. It would take many books, he says, merely to place on record the miraculous cures which had been wrought through the merits and intervention of Stephen the first Martyr in Calama and Hippo. To rescue at least some of them from oblivion, he had instituted the practice of sending in a *libellus* to the church, whenever a miracle happened. Seventy such *libelli*, he says, had been sent in, in the two years since the shrine of St. Stephen had been set up at Hippo.

The late Canon Mozley ("Bampt. Lect." p. 211) says that "ecclesiastical miracles never rise above a low level, and repeat again and again the same ambiguous types." He thinks that this is true of most of the miracles related by Augustine; and as to those of a more striking kind, such as the raising of several dead persons to life, he says that they are told so barely, briefly, and summarily, that they "evidently represent no more than mere report, and report of a very vague kind." I have admitted that these notices cannot be shown *not* to have rested on common report, but Canon Mozley was not justified in saying that "evidently" they had no other foundation. That they are very short is explained by Augustine's hurry to get the whole work finished and off his hands; and the real probability seems to be that they were abridged from some of the *libelli* sent in to the clergy by those who were cognizant of the facts, in accordance with Augustine's instruction. The author of "Supernatural Religion" (6th ed. 1875) shows at considerable length (pp. 175-187) that the distinction which Canon Mozley endeavours to establish between ecclesiastical miracles, such as those told by Augustine, and the Gospel miracles, is quite flimsy and illusory. He also well defends the simple rational manner in which Augustine relates his instances. But after this he abandons the subject; he does not think it necessary to examine Augustine's statements seriously. "Miracles are now denied," he says, "to places more enlightened than Naples or La Salette"; except in the "still ignorant and benighted corners of the earth, miracles are extinct." This superb air may well excite a smile. The writer himself probably dwells in Brixton, or Camberwell, or Islington, or some such London suburb; places of which some satirist—my brother, I think—referring to the advances in material civilisation which are made so much of, exclaims: "What profit is there in being able to travel a dozen times a day at the rate of fifty miles an hour from Brixton to Camden Town, if I leave a mean ignoble form of human existence behind me at Brixton, and find the same on arriving at Camden Town?" The "enlightenment" of the urban or suburban population, which sends crowded audiences night after night for a whole year to applaud a wretched travestie of

"Faust,"* would only be unreservedly acknowledged in the latitude of Greenwich, and not without protest even there. That miracles are "extinct" at Brixton and Camden Town, may be well believed. Among those for whom the sublime genius of Goethe is so completely a sealed book, no event is at all likely to occur which should disturb their dream of sense, and serve as a suggestion, or afford a glimpse, of a transcendental administration of this lower world. Naples I have never seen; as for La Salette it is merely a mountain. But I have looked down from the sanctuary of Fourvières on the great city standing at the junction of two mighty rivers; from the banks of the rushing Gave I have gazed at the basilica, which has risen, "like an exhalation," at the bidding of a modern devotion, and at the grand mountain peaks beyond; and I should be disposed to deny that either Lyons or Lourdes was a more "benighted" place than Brixton.

Ordericus Vitalis, a monk of St. Evroult in Normandy, of English birth, who died about 1140, inserts in his "*Historia Ecclesiastica*" (Bohn's translation, ii. 323) a letter written by Warin, afterwards Abbot of St. Evroult, containing a narrative of which the following is the substance. Warin, who at the time of writing was a monk in Thorney Abbey, is said by Orderic to have written the letter at the request and in the name of Hervé, Bishop of Ely (d. 1130) and the convent of monks.† It is headed, "To all the faithful sons of Holy Church, and especially to those under the Rule of St. Benedict," and proceeds to tell the following story.

In 1116 there was among the free-tenants of the convent of Ely an honest and simple man named Bricstan, dwelling at Chatteris in the fens. Being strongly attached to the monks, he at last formed the wish of taking the habit and placing all his property at their disposal. This came to the ears of one of Henry the First's servants, a wicked and unscrupulous man, by name Robert Malart. Robert went to the convent and charged Bricstan with being a thief and a usurer and appropriating the king's money. The monks being intimidated by what he said, refused to admit Bricstan to the habit. The poor man was brought to trial at Huntingdon, all the grandees of the county being present. Ralph Basset, one of Henry's creatures, was judge. Bishop Hervé came himself, and Reginald Abbot of Ramsay, and Robert Abbot of Thorney, and many other clerks and

* The talent of the principal performers is undeniable, but for the piece itself no words of condemnation can be too strong.

† The commencement of the letter seems to have been *accommodated*, either by Orderic himself or in the copy which he had before him, to a somewhat later date, for Henry I. (d. 1135) is spoken of as if no longer alive, yet Bishop Hervé, who caused the letter to be written, died in 1130.

monks. Bricstan was produced, with his wife. He was a short fat man, and the Norman aristocrats in the Court made game of him. The unjust judge sentenced him and all his substance to be at the king's mercy. He gave up all that he had in hand, and gave them information as to the rest. Being pressed to own to more property, he broke out in his rude English, "That wat min Lauert God Elmihtin that ic sege soth." Being required to swear to the truth of what he had said, he first appealed to his wife, conjuring her, if she knew of anything kept back, to reveal it, and not suffer him to commit perjury. She said that there was nothing else, except sixteen shillings in her own possession, and two rings. Bricstan then took the oath. Nevertheless he was taken up to London in custody, thrown into a dungeon, and heavily ironed. Here he remained five months, in what misery and hardship we may imagine; but during the whole time he ceased not to pray to God for help, and besought with great earnestness the intercession of St. Benedict, to whose rule, and that of St. Etheldrida,* to whose monastery, he had desired to attach himself. One night, when he was at his last gasp, having received no food for three days, deliverance came. Preceded by a great light, which made him screen his eyes with his hand, three saints appeared to him. One of them announced herself as St. Etheldrida; her companion, she said, was St. Benedict; the third—how recognized does not appear—was St. Sexburga. St. Benedict laid his hand on Bricstan's fetters, which immediately burst asunder. Then the saint threw them against the post which supported the gallery above, where the guards were lying; the post was cracked or broken, and the guards started up at the noise. Imagining that the prisoners had escaped, they left the gallery and came down to the dungeon, the doors of which they found fastened as they had left them. Having heard, both from the other prisoners and from Bricstan himself, all that had occurred, they sent a messenger in the morning to Queen Matilda, who happened to be then in London, to acquaint her with this strange event. The queen sent Basset to the prison. When he arrived, he was in a jeering humour. "What has happened to you, Bricstan? has God spoken to you by His angels? what witchcraft have you been at?" But when he heard from the prisoners about the light and the apparition, and saw the broken fetters, he altered his tone; he even wept, and conducted Bricstan at once to the queen. Matilda ordered that the bells of all the monasteries in London should be rung in honour of the miracle. Bricstan visited several churches to give thanks for his deliverance, and soon became the centre of an immense and excited multitude.

* Commonly called St. Audry.

At St. Peter's Church (Westminster Abbey) Abbot Gilbert and his monks came out to meet him in procession. Afterwards the queen sent him to Ely, where the writer of the letter, attended by the whole convent, went forth to meet him with candles and crosses, chanting "Te Deum laudamus." The habit was given to Bricstan, and his broken fetters were hung up in the church.

Such is the story ; and if any one chooses to say that it is all an invention of the monks of Ely, in order to bring credit to their convent and their order, he is of course at liberty to do so : I can only say that the impression which the narrative leaves on my mind is something quite different. It has to me an air of veracity and coherence ; nothing is concealed ; various well-known persons are named as having been more or less implicated in what is said to have happened ; and nothing is reported of any of these persons which, at the date assigned, he or she might not have done. It will be said, however, that, if the miracle was so amazing and so widely known, it must have left some trace in contemporary records. It is doubtful how far this argument can be pressed ; but it happens that, in this case, some corroborative testimony can be adduced. Henry of Huntingdon (d. about 1155), author of a well-known chronicle, writing of the church of Ely, mentions this miracle as one generally spoken of, and describes it in terms which entirely agree with those used by Orderic, except that he says that it was St. Etheldrida, not St. Benedict, who broke the prisoner's chains. He proceeds thus : "This man, by name Bricstan, with his wonderful chains, was received by the worshipful Queen Matilda, and by all the clergy and people of London in a triumphal procession. Returning, he was honourably welcomed in the church of the blessed virgin [St. Etheldrida]. His chains at this present time hang in front of the altar, and persons entering the church see and touch them with wonder."*

Let us come to the thirteenth century. The Sire de Joinville, in his history of St. Louis,† says that when the king, being on the voyage homewards from Cyprus, was sailing from Pantellaria‡ to the French coast, one of the ships in company lost a man overboard, who, though he made no effort to save himself, by swimming or otherwise, floated on the surface. Those on board the king's ship, which was fully a league astern, thought that the motionless floating object was a bale or a cask. One of the royal galleys§ picked the man up, and brought him to the king's

* *Henr. Hunt. "Hist. Angl." (Rolls Series), p. xxv.*

† *Ch. 129, ed. De Wailly, 1874.*

‡ An island between Sicily and Africa.

§ Joinville does not say where these galleys were, but it seems reasonable to suppose that they were in close attendance on the king.

ship. Joinville, who was on board, questioned the man—he was a Provençal, the esquire of a rich man named Dragonet,—and asked him why he had made no effort to save himself. The esquire said that there was no need, for as he was falling into the sea he recommended himself to Our Lady of Vauvert, and she held him up by the shoulders until the galley picked him up. Joinville adds that in honour of this miracle he caused a painting of it to be made, and placed in his own chapel in France.

This story shows how futile is the line of argument adopted by the author of "Supernatural Religion," that miracles do not happen except among backward and unenlightened populations—the insinuation being that they are accepted on mere hearsay, and rest on no evidence. All critics—including Voltaire himself—speak of Joinville as a man of honour and veracity,* and his testimony as to what he saw and heard may be accepted with as little—perhaps with less—hesitation than we should feel in reading the travels of Mr. Stanley or Mr. Froude. The facts of the story therefore, so far as they relate to him, may be held to have certainly occurred. And yet I do not infer from this as a certain conclusion that the man was saved by miracle, though I think it extremely probable. On a calm sea, a man remaining perfectly still, and content to have only his face and mouth above water, might float for a considerable time—certainly for the twenty minutes or so that may be presumed to have elapsed before the galley picked him up. Against this view, however, is the belief of Joinville and the other spectators that the floating object was a bale or a cask, either of which would have made far more show in the water than a man just keeping himself from sinking. It all comes to this, that those who disbelieve in the possibility of miracles will accept much that is improbable in order to reject Joinville's story, while those who believe that miracles are possible will accept the esquire's account of his deliverance as credible in itself, and as smoothing over all difficulty in the narrative.

Descending with the stream of Church history, we encounter in the fourteenth century the miracles of St. Catherine of Sienna; in the fifteenth, those of St. John Capistran and St. Francis of Paula; in the sixteenth, those of St. Francis Xavier and St. Thomas of Villanova. For the seventeenth century might be singled out the remarkable and well-attested miracles of St. Joseph of Cupertino; and for the eighteenth, those of St. Francis Girolamo and St. Veronica Giuliani. Lastly, from the crowded record of miracles wrought within the last eighty years those of

* "La bonne foi," says M. Michaud, "respire dans tout ce qu'il nous dit."

Lourdes might be selected, because the book describing the rise and progress of the *cultus* now established at that place is familiarly known in this country. The writer of that book, M. Lasserre, gives a circumstantial account of his own case, telling us that, after having suffered for months from a painful affection of the eyes, he was suddenly and permanently cured by the application of water from the spring that flows out of the rock in the Lourdes grotto. M. Lasserre still lives, and probably, if applied to through his Paris publishers (Victor Palmé) by an honest doubter, would supply any corroboration of his own statements that could reasonably be required.

The miracles thus selected as instances, or at any rate a very large proportion of them, are recorded upon evidence, which, if the subject-matter were not miraculous, would more than satisfy any reasonable man. It is not pretended by Catholics that, on account of the greatness of the issues, the verification of these events should be proceeded with on lines different from those which learned men in all countries employ in order to establish their conclusions. Learning is one; there is not a Catholic and a Protestant, a French and a German learning. This universal learning is based on logical method, and on the rules of historical and literary criticism which that method suggests; and these rules must be applied and satisfied in the case of any alleged miracle, before the assent of the understanding to its reality can be justly demanded. What logical and practical corollaries would follow from the completed verification of an adequate number of miraculous instances is too large a question to be treated at the end of an article, already perhaps unduly long. In sum, they would amount to this—miracles being proved, the Divine origin and overruling of the one Catholic Church in which they occur are proved also.

T. ARNOLD.

ART. II.—BARBOUR'S LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS.

THE discovery in 1871 of an hitherto unknown MS. containing a large collection of the unpublished writings of Barbour has not attracted the attention it deserves, and yet the fact is one not only of national interest, but, as we venture to think, has a very general interest. The name of the author of "The Bruce" is familiar to us all, and famous in Scotland as that of one of her earliest poets and historians, and we welcome the discovery in our own generation of another work from his pen—one calcu-

lated to sustain his fame as a man of great piety and learning, and as affording a fresh example of the purest style of the early Scottish language.

We owe the discovery of the legends to the late Mr. Bradshaw, librarian of the University of Cambridge, and for the publication of as much of the MS. as has as yet appeared in print we are indebted to the zeal of M. Horstmann, who has brought out an edition in Germany.*

That the legends should have attracted some attention abroad is gratifying, but we cannot but regret that as yet no edition has appeared in England; and while we trust that such an edition will eventually be published, we are tempted in the meantime to lay before our readers a specimen of the legends, together with a few words regarding the author himself and the scanty historical facts known in connection with him. The Saint whose legend we have chosen to illustrate our subject, also deserves some more special notice.

The exact date of Barbour's birth is uncertain, but it is conjectured to have taken place probably in or about the year 1316; and he is supposed to have been a native of Aberdeenshire. He is known to have studied both at Oxford and in France, and to have become a priest. He was raised to the dignity of Archdeacon of Aberdeen by the year 1357.† From the evidence of his writings, Barbour must have been a man of childlike faith and simplicity, but combined at the same time with a deep knowledge of the human heart. His poem of "The Bruce" shows him to have been a devoted patriot, animated by that zeal for Scotland's freedom which has at all times been one of the chief characteristics of his country.

It has been asserted that Barbour wrote "The Bruce" at the request of King David II. to honour the memory of his heroic father; but a comparison of dates proves this to have been impossible. The poem was evidently written in the latter years of the reign of Robert II., who likewise granted a certain pension

* Barbour's "des Schottischen Nationaldichten Legendensammlung," C. Horstmann, Heilbronn, 1881. The Legend of St. Machar is, however, not included in the collection of Scotch Legends, but is bound up in M. Horstmann's edition of the "Altenglische Legenden," Heilbronn, 1881.

† The cathedral of St. Machar, in Aberdeen, of which the nave now remains almost entire, was commenced in 1366. Bishop Henry Leighton (1422-40) erected the two western towers and founded the north transept. Bishop Lindsay (1441-59) paved and roofed the church, and Bishop Elphinstone built the central tower and the wooden spire.

In 1560, when the fury of the mob had wrecked this stately church, the leaden roofing, bells and other church property was shipped for Holland by the sacrilegious robbers, but the ship laden with these ill-gotten goods sank near the entrance of Aberdeen Harbour. Besides the cathedral, two parishes still bear the name of our saint—Old, and New, Machar.

to Barbour in token of his gratitude. Barbour's death took place in the year 1395-6, and it must have been during the last few years of his life that he wrote the legends we are considering. Of this we have his own testimony in the prologue to the Legends. The author tells us that he is debarred by his great age from continuing his priestly duties, and so to escape the dangerous vice of idleness he intends writing stories of the Saints.

To kene us how we suld do
 Tharefore in lytil space here
 I wryt the lyf of Sanctis sere
 How that mene ma ensample ta
 For to serwe God, as did thai.

M. Horstmann thinks it possible that the Legends were composed in the shape of familiar instructions to be read from the pulpit, but we incline to the belief that they were more probably intended as pious reading for the use of the faithful in general.

The author, as he tells us in the prologue, commences with the legends of the Twelve Apostles, giving each Saint in the order of his dignity instead of in the order of the Calendar. These are followed by legends of the immediate disciples of Our Lord, and after them we find the story of the two penitents—St. Mary Magdalen and St. Mary of Egypt. These again are succeeded by the lives of four martyred Saints, whose history is followed by that of four confessors, representing the three states of life—Matrimony, Continency, and Virginity. In compiling the remainder of the legends, Barbour does not seem to have followed any definite plan, but would appear to have grouped together the stories of the Saints with regard to the interest merely of particular legends and their reference one to another, as will be seen by the following list :—

St. Margaret	SS. Cosmas and Damian
St. Placid	St. Ninian
St. Theodora	St. Agnes
St. Eugenia	St. Agatha
St. Justina	St. Cæcilia
St. George	St. Lucy
St. Palagia	St. Christina
St. Thadea	St. Anastasia
St. Baptista	St. Euphemia
St. Vincent	St. Juliana
St. Adrian	St. Thekla

St. Katherine.

The chief source from which Barbour has taken the legends appears to be from the "*Legenda Auræa*," and they are as a rule free translations, interspersed, however, with the author's

own reflections and comments ; and he seems also to have introduced some matter from other sources now lost. Again, some of the legends claim other origin than the "*Legenda Auræa* ;" for instance, that of St. Thadeus, which is taken from the "*Vitæ Patrum*," itself the original source of the "*Golden Legend*." Another great exception is the legend of St. Machar of Aberdeen. This legend is taken from the "*Vita Sancti Macharii*," now lost, from which life the six lessons for the Saint's feast in the Aberdeen Breviary were likewise probably derived.

As it would be impossible to consider in full the whole of these interesting legends, we have selected for illustration the story of St. Machar ; and this for several reasons. As the friend and companion of the great St. Columba, and as being with him one of the earliest apostles of the North of Scotland, the life is historically interesting, and in the absence of any other full account of the Saint, Barbour's legend is of peculiar value.

That Barbour should have given us this life, the only one of a Scottish saint in the collection (with the exception of that of St. Ninian), shows his special desire to honour the memory and spread the fame of the patron Saint of Aberdeen, of whom he complains that even in his day too little was known, and portions of whose cathedral now alone remain to remind the inhabitants of Aberdeen of their great apostle. We have, of course, followed Barbour entirely in our short sketch of St. Machar's life and labours ; but there are several points in the legend to which we would wish specially to call attention. It will be observed that Barbour distinctly states that St. Machar spent the last few years of his life at Tours, and that he died Bishop of that city. In this his account agrees with that given in the Aberdeen Breviary, where we are told that the Saint was buried at Tours—"His body the Church of Tours in reverence retains." But of this fact, unfortunately, no proof now remains. St. Machar's name does not occur in the list of the Archbishops of that diocese, either under this name or under that of Mauritius, the name given to the Saint by the Pope just before the journey to Tours, and on occasion of his consecration. Nor again can we find any historical evidence that the shrine erected, as Barbour tells us, over St. Machar's body and close to the tomb of St. Martin, existed.* At first sight therefore it seems difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile Barbour's statements with facts ; but there is one way in which we think it is possible to prove that Barbour was not mistaken, or only partially mistaken, in his statement. We know that the Archdiocese of Tours possessed several

* The fact of the Saint being buried in "*St. Martin's Chamber*," and the miracles which occurred at his tomb, are likewise commemorated in the Hymn for the Saint's Office in the Aberdeen Breviary.

suffragan Sees, whose Bishops were under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Tours. Among these Sees we find mention of Le Mans, Rennes, Vannes, and other Armorican Sees.

The inhabitants of these suffragan dioceses, being a Keltic-speaking race, would have a community of language with our Saint, and may we not conjecture that when, as Barbour describes, the clergy of Tours earnestly besought St. Columba to leave them one of his companions to preach the knowledge of God, they were seeking to give the Bretons a Bishop whose language would be almost familiar to them? And therefore it is possible to conclude that, although at present we cannot certify that St. Machar was Bishop of Tours itself, he very probably occupied one of the Sees subordinate to that diocese. Writing, as Barbour did, seven centuries after the Saint's death, and with but scanty written records to bear out the traditions which had come down to him, such a confusion of facts would not be unlikely to occur. As regards the statement that St. Machar was buried at Tours, we think that a possible explanation may have been that his sanctity, being so well known and honoured throughout the diocese, a commemorative shrine, possibly containing some of the relics, was erected in the church of St. Martin, believed by succeeding generations to be the actual burying-place of the Saint.

The whole story of the Saint's connection with Tours and his devotion to St. Martin is especially interesting, and affords another proof of the peculiar veneration felt by our early Scotch missionaries for that great Saint. Our readers will recall the affection evinced by St. Ninian for St. Martin, and the interesting details of their mutual friendship to which the church erected in Galloway by St. Ninian long bore witness. This church, which St. Ninian caused to be built by workmen brought from Tours, was in course of erection when St. Martin died, and St. Ninian dedicated it to him, the first of many churches in Scotland which were placed under the invocation of the Saint of Tours. If we consider also the long friendship that was so happily to unite France and Scotland for many generations, it is pleasant to trace the commencements of this sympathy in those early days of our national history, and to connect it with the mutual friendships of the Saints of the two countries. In conclusion, we would suggest that the legend of St. Machar is but one of the many gems of saintly biography contained in these volumes of Barbour, which we earnestly recommend to the study of our readers.

LEGEND OF ST. MACHAR.

Born of a noble race, Machar was the son of Syaconus, a king or chief in Ireland, and Synchene his wife, and being baptized by St. Colman, was named "Mocumma." From his infancy God's

grace shone in him brightly, and angels watched over him. The king, his father, saw one day these gracious visitants hovering over the house where the child lay, singing heavenly music, and entering, saw them watching round the infant's cradle. Filled with joy, he praised God for the gift of such a son, and prayed that he might be kept from all evil, and grow up in God's service; and he and the queen, in token of their gratitude to Heaven, redoubled their prayers and alms-deeds.

Before long, a great sorrow came upon them; another son was born, who died without the grace of baptism, and the country was plunged into mourning; but the king, calling to mind the privileges granted to his eldest son, commanded that the body of the dead child should be taken to Mocumma and laid beside him, trusting in God's mercy that the elder brother might win grace for the younger; and his faith was rewarded, for the child was restored to life, to the joy and wonder of the whole people.

Other marvels are recorded as having occurred during Mocumma's childhood, and so he grew in strength and virtue, showing gracious promise of his future holiness.

When his boyhood was passed, Syaonus, who had a special veneration for St. Columba, besought that Mocumma might join his disciples, and Columba consenting, the youth quickly became one of his most devoted followers, and was specially beloved by his master, whose teaching he kept ever in his heart. Making rapid progress, he soon surpassed his fellow-disciples as well in knowledge as in virtue, and he was especially remarkable for his great humility. Lest we should wonder at the perfection attained by Mocumma in so short a space of time, Barbour reminds us that Solomon became wise in a single night—"For to God as we ma se, Naething may impossible be."

Columba perceiving how clearly God's grace shone in his pupil, spoke of him in these terms to his other disciples:—

Zone mane that schenis as a zeme,
I ame nocht dingne to lere, trewly
Fore angelis of tyme sene haf I
Repare til hyme I kene hyme al
That he wald lere, gret and smal,
& namely, hou he huly wryt
Sal understand & expound It.

The others hearing these praises of Mocumma were filled with envy, and strove to disparage him, but Columba knowing the jealousy of their hearts was unmoved, and continued to cherish Mocumma singularly. Meanwhile the fame of Mocumma's virtues spread through Ireland, and crowds flocked to visit him from all parts of the country. Mocumma desiring to escape this

homage shown to him, and feeling that wish which comes to all Saints of ridding himself of earthly ties, and devoting himself more entirely to God's service and the good of souls, determined to leave his native land and go whither he should be unknown, and where his royal birth might not stand in the way of the work he contemplated. Therefore opening his heart to his master, he declared to him his wishes. Columba rejoiced at his resolution, and confided to him his own determination to seek another land wherein to preach God's truth, but counselled Mocumma to endeavour in the first place to gain the consent of his family and friends, who might naturally be displeased at his project. Mocumma, however, replying in the touching words of Ruth, assured Columba that in the future he should consider him as his earthly father and Holy Church as his mother, and so he should follow his master, "Fore quhare thu gays wil I ga, Til ded tak ane of ws twa."

Columba, rejoicing at the perfection to which his pupil had attained, declared to him that as in youth he had borne the name of Mocumma, the time was now come when, as he had attained to manhood in Christ, a more appropriate name should be his, and called him from that time forth Machar. Then Columba, desiring a boat to be prepared and provision to be made for the voyage, he entered it with those who were willing to accompany him, and Machar in his eagerness was the first to place himself in the boat. The voyage was prosperous, and after sailing for a time they reached in safety the shores of Hy (Iona), where one called Melumma hospitably received them. After a time Columba, seeing that the island was fair, adorned with trees, and "spryg and well is fare and clere," chose it for the place of his abode, and caused huts to be erected for himself and his monks—the lowly commencements of the world-famed monastery of Iona. Machar meanwhile was sent to preach the Gospel in the Island of Mull, hard by, and after accomplishing this mission he returned to his master and devoted himself to the study of Holy Scripture. Miraculous assistance was granted to him in his work, and his brother monks began to murmur at the favours received by their comrade, and accused him to Columba as a sorcerer, declaring that their master must choose between them and him. Columba, grieving at their hardness of heart, and at the necessity either of banishing that disciple (or, as Barbour quaintly calls him, Printyse) whom he most loved, or those whom he had cherished from their youth upwards, besought the brethren to hold their peace for a time, and deliberating within himself, decided to send Machar from him to preach the Gospel on the mainland of Scotland. Sending for Machar, therefore, he reminded

him of Our Lord's words to His disciples : " Go, therefore, and teach all nations," and of the impossibility of continuing this work on the island on which they dwelt ; and telling him that as his own age forbids him journeying far to spread God's seed, Machar, as younger, " Scharpare of wyt and mare mychttty," should carry the tidings of the faith to the many lying in darkness. Machar agreed willingly to his master's wishes, answering that it was good for him to do his bidding. Then giving him twelve companions to assist him, Columba made him presents of a bishop's staff, a belt, and two of his own garments, together with some books, and ordered a galley to be provisioned for the voyage. When therefore Machar was ready to pass the sea, Columba called the other brethren together, and reminding them how he had fostered them for so many years, and how earnestly he had striven to inculcate charity among them, he reproached them for their unbrotherly conduct to Machar, who had never wronged them. Touched by his words, they repented of their wickedness, and implored St. Columba to reconcile them with him whom they had injured, and Machar willingly consenting, they separated in all peace and charity. Machar, after receiving his beloved master's blessing, embarked on his perilous voyage, and after sailing for three days he and his companions disembarked on the coast of Aberdeenshire. Near where they landed they found dwelling a certain " Cristine man " named Farcare : a man of wealth and position, who, when he had discovered who they were, greeted them with great joy, and knowing by fame of Machar's holiness, besought them to enter his town (or dwelling ?) and pressed them to accept all that was needful to them. Profiting by the Saint's teaching, Farcare made great progress in the spiritual life, and praised God that he was considered worthy of harbouring such a guest. Full of love for his instructor, he desired to make over to him his lands in that part, in order that they might be devoted to God's service. Machar accepted the gift, and, remembering St. Columba's prophetic words regarding the spot upon which he was to build his church, sought till he found a piece of ground on the banks of the river, round which the water flowed in the shape of a bishop's staff. Seeing this, Machar called his disciples and declared to them that he had found the place foretold him by his beloved master, announcing to them—" Lo, here myne dwelling-place for ay." Then he caused the ground to be prepared and a costly church to be erected—that church which was hereafter to be called after its saintly founder, and on the site of which there still remains entire the stately nave of the cathedral built in later years to honour the patron Saint of Aberdeen. While the church was being built the workmen suffered much from thirst, and in their

distress appealed to Machar, who, always full of sympathy and pity, by his prayers caused a spring of fair water to flow. This spring still existed in Barbour's time.

This is the first miracle recorded of St. Machar in the new land of his apostleship—that country which Barbour quaintly describes as “now the name is Scotland, bot Pychtis then in it were duelland.” Near by our Saint's dwelling-place there lived a holy man named Dewynik, who had served the Lord from his youth. Between him and St. Machar a loving friendship grew up; but they were not long to enjoy this mutual comfort. One day Dewynik, coming to his friend, represented to him how many were still living in spiritual darkness in other parts of the country, and proposed that, while Machar should remain to instruct the Picts, he himself should go into Caithness to preach the Gospel. Machar was grieved to leave him, but Dewynik replied that they would meet in the heavenly kingdom, and knowing that his own days were numbered, besought Machar to promise that when tidings of his death should reach him, he would cause his body to be brought back and buried in the country in which he had so long dwelt. Machar promised, and they parted, to meet no more in this life—Dewynik to go into Caithness, and Machar to continue his work among the Picts, where his apostleship was greatly blessed, many of the leading men and the greater part of the people being converted to Christianity by his means. The temples and idols were destroyed, and his mission was blessed by many miracles and graces: among others, we are told how the Saint restored a person to life, delivered another from the power of the devil and gave sight to the blind. We select one of the last-named miracles as an example:—

Ane vthir tyme Sanct Machor zed
Prechand & sawand Godis Sed,
Mene brocht a mane that was blind-borne
& seit hyme Sanct Machor beforne
& prayt hyme ful fare that he
Thru his prayere wald gere hyme se,
& he, that reucht ay in hert had,
Tuk wattir & blissit it but bad
& there-with-all ennoyntit richt thane
Oure-corce the eyne of that blind mane
& sad till hyme “luk vpe and se”
& as he bad, richt saw did he:
& saw als clerly all-kine thinge
As he of sicht had neur merring,
And that na tyme saw befor,
Saw thane, & lowyt Sanct Machor,
Qubame thru the sieht God swa hyme gese.

The fame of Machar's holiness spread abroad, and people came from other countries to gain his blessing. Among these are specially mentioned two young men from Ireland, who, after long search, discovered Machar's abode, and being, as Barbour says, "Sume dele lettryt," anxiously desired his assistance in the study and understanding of Holy Scripture. The Saint received them with much kindness, and instructed them in Christian knowledge, and in all that concerned their soul's health; but his words fell on barren soil, and these young men took their departure, reviling the learning and admonitions of the Saint, and calling him a hypocrite. But their irreverence did not pass unpunished; sudden death overtook them, and their bodies falling into a morass, were never recovered.

Meanwhile Machar's fellow-workman in the Lord's vineyard, St. Dewynik, was approaching the term of his labours in Caithness. On his deathbed Dewynik desired his disciples, as soon as he should be dead, to bear his body to one of Machar's churches, and remind his friend of his promise on the occasion of their sorrowful parting. When all was over, therefore, the disciples hastened to fulfil their master's bidding, and bore the sorrowful news to St. Machar. The latter was deeply grieved at the tidings, but strove to resign himself to God's holy will, and spent the night in prayer. During this vigil he was consoled by a vision of angels watching over St. Dewynik's body. Rejoicing at this testimony to his friend's beatitude, Machar, when day came, summoned his disciples to accompany him, saying they must hasten to perform the rites of burial, and sing the Office appointed for those who die in the Lord. Machar buried his saintly friend at Banchory, and the place in Barbour's own day was still known as Banchory-Dewynik. It would be pleasant to linger over this period of our Saint's life: but for a fuller account of the miracles, and for a pretty story of the visit of St. Ternan, a neighbouring Bishop, to Machar, we must refer our readers to Barbour's graphic description, and follow the Saint's life in its concluding years.

A few years before his death Machar was consoled by a visit from his beloved master, St. Columba, and so rejoiced were the Saints to meet that they shed tears of joy. Then, as on a former occasion, St. Columba had confided to Machar his intention of leaving his native country to evangelize Scotland, he now told him that he was again bent upon a long journey, and that he purposed to make a pilgrimage to Rome. Machar implored that he might be allowed to accompany him, to which St. Columba consented, and the two Saints set forth on their way to those foreign lands from whence Machar was not destined to return.

Their journey was long and toilsome, but God watched over them singularly, and many wonders were wrought on their behalf, and so at last they came to the Eternal City, and hastened first to the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, as is the pious practice of all pilgrims on first reaching Rome. The Pope (St. Gregory the Great), hearing of the arrival of the two venerable pilgrims, sent for them to his presence, and received them with great kindness and reverence, inquiring the object of their journey, and asking many questions about the distant land from which they came. They, in a few words, making known the cause of their journey, thus replied :—

The cause of this trawall
That we haf tane one hand but fale
Is for-to wyne lestened renude,
Till our sawlis eftire our dede.
Ane uthir cause als haf we eke
Petire and Paule here for-to seke,
And mony uthir in this stede
For Godis sake that tholit dede,
& for till haf zoure benysone
& zoure gud informacione.

The Pope then calling Machar to him, told him that he should create him Bishop of the Picts, and bade him change his name. Thus he who had been called in his own country Mocumma, and in the land of his apostleship Machor, was hereafter, by the bidding of the Holy Father, to be called Morise. On a day fixed the Pope consecrated Morise, after instructing him in all the duties of the episcopal state, and then addressed him in this strain :—

Lo, bruther & in Criste sone dere
Thru wefcheyng of our handis here
The haly gast als callit the
Of bischape to the dignite
That is schofine & to the hicht,
Trawale that for all thi mycht
In Goddis wyne-zarde forto vyne
Fule folk that bundine ar with syne
The wark of wangeliste tha do,
& the office, that is the to
Committit, fulfill ilke day
& unprofit kepe the ay.
& gaynand & unchangeabili,
As thu se nid is, thu chastly
In pacience argw, and pray
& in doctrine be besy ay.

After this ceremony the new Bishop and St. Columba received again the Pope's blessing, and then set forth on their

VOL. XVII.—NO. II. [*Third Series.*]

return journey. According to Barbour's narrative, the two Saints had no settled plan of visiting Tours on their way home, but Providence would seem to have led them to that town, dear to them as containing the shrine of St. Martin. While they were approaching Tours, the Bishop of that town—to whom God made known the holiness of His servants—came forth to meet them, accompanied by his clergy, and made them welcome, entertaining them most hospitably. Not content with thus honouring the pilgrims, the Bishop urged them to remain and dwell at Tours, but St. Columba, whom nothing could tempt to abandon Scotland, could not be persuaded to comply with this request. Then the clergy implored him that he would at least leave them, in his place, one of his disciples to preach God's word to them.

Columba was disturbed at this request, and he and his companions remained silent till St. Morise spoke, and addressing St. Columba as his "*fadire dere*," said whatever the Saint thought needful to command he would undertake as being God's will, however hard or painful it might be. Columba blessing his resolve, declared he should remain at Tours to work in God's cause, and comfort Holy Church for three years, and that when this was accomplished he should receive the heavenly reward, and be with himself and St. Martin fellow-saints in God's kingdom. The tender friendship which united the two Saints, made the parting a hard one, and Morise affectionately reproached his master for leaving him thus alone amongst strangers; and to console him Columba promised always to be near him in spirit. Then they repaired together to the Bishop to ask his blessing before Columba should set out on his journey. After this leaving-taking was accomplished, Columba spent the night in prayer in the church of St. Martin, where it is said the great Bishop appeared to him and gave him the book of the Gospels, which had been buried with him. This book, preserved as a great treasure by Columba, was left by him at his death to his church.* When the night was passed, Columba left Tours, accompanied by Morise and many of the clergy and laity, who, after escorting him for some distance, took leave of him with much sorrow, or as Barbour has it,

With oft blissing and regrat bath,
For it is a full noyus thing
Of dere friendis the departying.

* It will be observed that Barbour's version of this occurrence differs from the account given by O'Donnell, who says that the people of Tours having lost the remembrance of the place of St. Martin's sepulture, begged Columba to discover it for them, which he consented to do on condition that he should be allowed to take whatever was in the hallowed tomb, except the bones of the Saint, and became in this way the possessor of the precious book.

The night after St. Columba's departure, the Bishop of Tours had a vision regarding the new teacher who had been given to his flock. St. Martin appeared to him, and bade him praise God for the grace done to Tours in possessing so great a servant of God as its apostle and intercessor; one whose heavenly reward would be equal to that of the patriarchs and prophets, whose example he had followed on earth, by leaving his mighty kindred and all this world's goods to undertake for God's sake this long pilgrimage. The Bishop lost no time in consulting his clergy upon this vision, and so impressed were they all with its heavenly character, that the Bishop, with the unanimous consent of his flock, gave St. Morise full jurisdiction over himself and his diocese.

The Saint's work at Tours was greatly blessed; he himself was the most beautiful example of the virtues he preached, and the clergy and people rejoiced at possessing such a pastor. Temporal blessings were likewise granted to Morise's prayers, so that during the time of his episcopacy no pestilence troubled man or beast, and the seasons were fair and fruitful. When three and a half years had passed, the time of his exile, as foretold by St. Columba, was accomplished, and his reward was at hand. Falling into a "lytill fewire," the Saint was soon in danger, and after six days, so rapid was the disease, death was at hand. He caused his grave to be made, and had himself carried to his oratory, and then desiring his disciples to come to him, he bade them a loving farewell, exhorting them to continue in the practice of all virtues and of brotherly charity; and as they weeping implored him not to leave them desolate, he assured them that he would always be near them, making intercession for their needs before the throne of God. As God had blessed his life with many supernatural blessings, so in his death these graces continued. The Bishop and religious who surrounded Morise's deathbed saw Our Lord and the twelve Apostles standing by him, and St. Martin and St. Columba also present to receive the soul of their brother in Christ. Our Lord, addressing Morise, welcomed him in loving words to heaven. At these gracious words Morise rose, and throwing himself on his knees, said in a strong voice, "In manus tuas Domine, my saule I gyf," and so saying he yielded up his soul to his Maker.

The legend goes on to tell us that the people of Tours, in token of their reverence for St. Morise, laid his body by the side of St. Martin, and erected a costly shrine over the tomb; and from the date of the Saint's death till Barbour's own day the miracles wrought by his intercession continued to show forth his glory.

M. M. MAXWELL SCOTT.

ART. III.—WAR AND BALLOONING.

THE object which stimulated the practical invention of the balloon was its use in war. In theory, the balloon was invented before the experiments of the brothers Montgolfier. Theory is ever the soil of practice—a soil that is compounded from the thoughts of many. The idea of the balloon has its starting-point in the principle elucidated by Archimedes of Syracuse, two hundred years before the Christian era—viz., that a body must remain suspended in a fluid denser than itself. Even before the exact period of the Renaissance of science, we read of many suggestions for accomplishing the suspension of a globe in the air. These suggestions were, in common with many others of that period, a mixture of truth and error. Albert of Saxony, a monk who lived in the fourteenth century, states that fire enclosed in a hollow globe would raise it to a certain height. In the fifteenth and sixteenth century we discover alchemical tenets in the ideas concerning aerial ascents. It was conceived that the dew which fell during the night was of celestial origin shed by the stars: this was drawn up again to heaven by the sun's rays in the morning; which belief led to the suggestion that an egg-shell filled with morning dew would rise in the air. That these early dreams of the philosophers of this age attracted attention is evident from the satire produced on them by the witty French writer, Cyrano de Bergerac, which was entitled "The Comical History of the States and Kingdoms in the Sun and Moon." In this romance, a French traveller, in order to reach the moon, fastens round his body some flasks filled with the morning dew. The flasks, however, are broken and the traveller precipitated to the ground. When cured of his wounds, he makes another attempt by means of a machine acting on a train of wheels. Failing again, he applies rockets to the machine and at last reaches the moon.

A notable project of this period was that of the Jesuit Lana, in 1670. He proposed to make a balloon of thin copper and to exhaust it of air. This would have been a vain attempt, as the weight of the external air would have crushed the copper globe thus exhausted.

In 1766, Cavendish ascertained the true nature of hydrogen gas, which is the lightest substance known, being about fourteen times as light as air. This discovery led Joseph Black, the Professor of Chemistry at the University of Edinburgh, to suggest in one of his lectures that a weight might be lifted from the ground by attaching to it a sphere filled with hydrogen gas. A

fruitful idea, once expressed, is rarely lost, however casual its first expression. Some years later, Tiberius Cavallo, an Italian merchant, remembered the remark of Dr. Black, and in 1782 tested its truth by experiment. He first manufactured some paper bags, which he filled with hydrogen gas. To his disappointment the subtle gas escaped through the pores of the paper. He then collected the gas in soapy water, and the bubble of gas ascended. A soap bubble, filled with hydrogen gas, was therefore the first balloon. The experiment seems to have been repeated at one of the meetings of the Royal Society, and described in the Transactions of that society; but neither Cavallo nor his colleagues pursued the experiment further, and there was still to be found that peculiar kind of energy that would transform the laboratory experiment into a practical reality. Books are, indeed, the carriers of thought. It is probably due to a work of Priestley, in which were described these discoveries of Cavallo, and which was translated into French, that Joseph Montgolfier, of Annonay, was fired to perform an experiment that is historical. Stephen and Joseph Montgolfier were the sons of the proprietor of an extensive paper manufactory at Annonay. These brothers were keen observers, and although they lived in an obscure country town they were possessed of a considerable information. They usually carried on their experiments in concert. Their first attempt at a balloon was to repeat Cavallo's experiment, by sending up bags of paper filled with hydrogen gas—like him, to fail and to be discouraged because the gas escaped through the pores of the paper.

In 1782 Joseph Montgolfier filled a paper, or, as some say, a silk, bag with heated air. Probably he tried the experiment with both materials. The bag rose to a considerable height—some say, 75 feet. Montgolfier was not content with such trifling efforts; a patriotic motive stimulated him to make the invention of use to France in her wars, and the pioneer bag of 40 cubic feet capacity was succeeded by one of 680 cubic feet; this again by one of 23,000 cubic feet. Montgolfier seemed on the high road to a brilliant and unrivalled fame. There was, however, another brain actively employed in eclipsing, or at any rate diminishing, the fame of Montgolfier—that of Charles the Parisian. He realized that using heated air would never become a satisfactory method of filling balloons; air, as heated in a fire balloon, being three-fourths the weight of air at the ordinary temperature. He also doubtless had in his mind's eye the danger of connecting fire with a balloon—a danger often realized since, to the sacrifice of human life. He therefore took up the experiments with hydrogen gas where Cavallo and the Montgolfiers had left off. Hydrogen gas being some fourteen

times as light as air, its superiority for filling balloons was, to his mind, indisputable. The missing link that was necessary for the success of the experiment was found by him. By means of varnish he succeeded in making a material gas-proof, and consequently produced the first gas balloon. From the efforts of Montgolfier and Charles commenced the history of ballooning. The purport of this article is not, however, to discuss or relate its general history with its startling incidents, often bristling with hair-breadth escapes and tragedies, but to point out the use of the balloon as an adjunct to war.

By many persons, those who advocate its use in war are looked upon as enthusiasts—with some an enthusiast is synonymous with a fanatic. Granted enthusiasm is sometimes expended on improper subject-matter—wild incoherent schemes, devoid of that backbone of practicability which is essential to the success of a scheme; but give enthusiasm proper subject-matter, truth and coherency, it becomes a noble thing; it is, in fact, the life-blood of science and art. In other words, it is earnestness of purpose. The use of balloons in war is worthy of this earnestness of purpose. The way in which balloons have been chiefly utilized in war, is for taking observations of the enemy. In such cases, the balloons are captive. As early as in 1793 the French Government made use of such balloons, and their use was attended with success in those wars which the French Government carried on soon after the French Revolution.

It was Guyten de Merveau, one of the earliest experimenters in ballooning, who suggested this use of captive balloons to the Committee of Public Safety. A few years before this Guyten had been more ambitious. He had sought to direct a balloon against the wind, by means of oars. His was the second attempt on record at balloon navigation. His proposals to the French Government were less ambitious, and consequently more practical than his early experiments.

The balloon experiments which the French Government instituted at Meudon, under Guyten de Merveau, Contelle and Conté, were so successful that a company was formed, called *Aerostiers*. The first balloon made was called the "*Entrepenant*." This was used at the siege of Maubeuge and Charleroi, also at the battle of Fleurus. On this latter occasion it is recorded that the balloon remained in the air ten consecutive hours, every movement of the enemy being seen and signalled. It was again used at the siege of Mainz. In 1796 the French War Committee manufactured some more balloons, which were sent to the armies at Düsseldorf and Stuttgart on the Rhine respectively. Altogether, it seems that more practical work with captive balloons was done at this time in actual war than has been accomplished

since. It was Napoleon who stopped their career of usefulness in France. He does not seem to have set much value on the use of balloons in war, as he only took out balloons on one campaign—the Egyptian campaign in 1796—and did not use them actually in the field. Some of the balloon apparatus was captured by the English. A few years later the balloon corps was dissolved, and until so recent a date as 1859 no further experiments in balloon warfare were conducted in France.

Captive balloons were used in the Civil War in America in 1861; and later on a balloon corps was instituted by the Federals. In connection with these balloons, telegraphic communication between the balloon and the ground was established, an improvement upon the manner in which the French had communicated their messages in the operations described above. The latter communicated intelligence by sending down from the balloon notes attached to small bags of ballast.

It is this use of captive balloons for observation that has been revived by the English Government, and experiments are now continually being made in the neighbourhood of Chatham, under a committee of the Royal Engineers. Notably amongst those who have been pre-eminent in this revival, are Major Elsdale, R.E., Major Templar and Lieutenant Mackenzie, R.E. The Royal Engineers sent a balloon exhibit to the War Department of the late Inventions Exhibition at South Kensington. Perhaps the most important feature of that exhibit was a balloon made of gold-beaters' skin, such as was used in the war in Egypt. Gold-beaters' skin is an admirable substance for forming balloons, on account of its lightness and capacity for retaining gas. It is a curious fact that this excellent substance was proposed as a balloon material as long ago as two centuries before the means of raising a balloon from the ground was discovered.

The use of captive balloons has been somewhat dependent on meteorological conditions. This fact has in the past been a hindrance to the development of balloons for military purposes. In a high wind it is very difficult to carry out captive balloon ascents successfully; wind has a tendency to blow the balloon as far as possible to leeward of the point of retention, and therefore downwards. A plan has been proposed by Mr. Douglas Archibald to enable a captive balloon to be used in windy weather. This is to be accomplished by the combination of a kite with a balloon. The inventor of this apparatus, which promises well, claims that it works successfully; that in a wind of considerable force the very power which would otherwise blow the balloon down horizontally, is utilized in raising it. As soon as the wind drops the elevating power of the balloon acts, and so little does this differ in direction from the elevating power of the kite, that if properly

adjusted the combination remains at nearly the same elevation, wind or no wind. The kite can be made very light; and while in a calm it adds very little to the weight, whenever there is any wind it increases the elevating power enormously, since, in addition to the elevating power of the gas, we have the vertical component of the wind acting upwards, which is ordinarily lost. Another advantage is increased steadiness to the balloon, since there is none of the revolving which takes place when a balloon is fastened simply by its lower extremity.

The free balloon has its use in war as well as the captive one. At the siege of Paris this use of balloons was demonstrated most efficiently. At the time when the Parisians found themselves cut off from all means of communication, the number of balloons in Paris was very small. But the successful escape of some *aéronaute*s in these few was considered so encouraging that an aerial highway was established. This involved a more wholesale manufacture of balloons than has been undertaken either before or after that period. The disused railway stations became balloon manufactories and training schools for *aéronaute*s.

During four months, sixty-six balloons left Paris, fifty-four being specially made for the administration of post and telegraph; 160 persons were carried over the Prussian lines; 300,000 letters reached their destination; 360 pigeons were taken up, of which fifty-seven came back. These, however, brought 100,000 messages. Amongst the persons to make use of the aerial highway was Gambetta.

These facts show that free balloons, even when destitute of any system of guidance, are useful in war.

The utility of a free balloon would be largely increased if it could be steered against a wind of any considerable power. Attempts have been made to navigate balloons on two principles: (1) By using the various currents of the air; (2) By some kind of mechanical propulsion.

1. As regards the latter, mechanical propulsion, there are some persons who, when they hear any suggestion regarding a steerable balloon, denounce the idea as impossible to be accomplished. It surely is a wiser course to reserve a definite opinion as to whether such a thing is possible in the future, as the experiments that have been tried in this direction are few and far between, and it is unwise to draw conclusions on a basis of inadequate facts. It is, however, pretty certain that those who have the task in hand have a difficult problem before them.

There is an essential difference of condition between navigating the water and navigating the air. In the former, we have a body moving within the limits of two media, air and water; these two media have different densities and elasticities, and

consequently resistances. In air navigation, the body moves in one medium only, which renders the motion of a paddle-wheel entirely useless in that one medium: a paddle-wheel moving in the air would effect nothing; therefore, in air navigation the screw is adopted. This cuts into the medium, but it stands to reason that the medium must be in a state of comparative rest, or else the work of the screw will be overpowered. A moderate wind is sufficient to do this. Hence the difficulties in air navigation. Captain Renard has recently sent into the French Academy an account of his so-called navigable balloon, "*La France*," at Meudon. His experiments were interesting, because the results obtained were in advance of anything yet accomplished in balloon guidance; but there has been a tendency to exaggerate the results of these experiments. The experiments took place in comparatively calm weather. It is reported that out of seven journeys the balloon returned five times to the place whence it started. To accomplish this much care and ingenuity must have been exercised; but, on reading the accounts of the experiments, we find that great care was taken for the selection of that kind of weather that would not make the work of the screw *nil*. A whole month, in fact, elapsed between the first ascent mentioned and the second, owing to unfitness of weather. On the day of the second experiment the wind blew from the north-north-east from Paris, at a velocity of about 3 to 3.50 mètres per second. Starting from Meudon, the balloon was directed towards Paris, at 4.25 P.M. It crossed the railway line at 4.55 P.M.; reached the Seine at 5 P.M.; at 5.12 P.M. the balloon entered the "*enceinte*" by the bastion 65. Then the *aéronauts* decided to go home. The balloon was easily turned, and, aided now by the *aërial* current, reached the exact spot whence it started. The journey going took forty-seven minutes; the journey back took eleven minutes. Such experiments as these are deserving of praise, because they were conducted in a scientific manner, and because some results were obtained, although such a result as navigating a balloon against a wind of even moderate power certainly did not come to pass. We must, it seems, still be content with mere bread-crumbs of *aërial* navigation.

2. As regards the method of navigating the air by a fit selection of those varying currents that are frequently overlaying one another, blowing in different directions over the same spot, I think a closer and more methodical study of those currents might lead to satisfactory results. Up to the present time but little has been ascertained concerning them. Unfortunately for *aéronautical* science, its *Glaishers* have been few, its *mountebanks* many. It is true there has always been a difficulty in the way of studying the *aërial* currents from a balloon—that is the difficulty

of keeping the balloon at a certain elevation. After expending ballast to make the balloon rise to a certain elevation for the sake of reaching a particular current, some change of temperature produced by the sun or clouds will often affect the delicately balanced machine and alter its altitude. If it has risen higher, gas must be sacrificed to attain the lower level; if it has descended, more ballast must be expended. In this way gas and ballast are quickly exhausted. It is such facts as these which make the successful experiment carried out by M. L'Hoste last August so worthy of note. In his voyage across the Channel he made use of a piece of apparatus called "*A Flotteur Frein*." This acted as a kind of floating anchor, or brake; and was a cylindrical iron vessel with a conical air chamber at the top, 1 mètre 60 centimètres in length, 22 centimètres in width, weighing 10 kilogrammes when empty, and 60 kilogrammes when filled with salt water. The flotteur was attached to a bar underneath the balloon, on which a small sail was hoisted. The important function of this flotteur is, that by its means the same altitude of the balloon can be maintained when the favourable current is once found. By means of this flotteur the water itself can be drawn up into a reservoir in the balloon and utilized as ballast after sunrise, when the expansion by heat of the sun's rays would otherwise have caused it to shoot upward. By this method of adjusting the altitude of the balloon, several important observations, of the various currents of air about which we know so little, might be taken; and it would be well if Governments organized experiments with these various currents, as well as with elaborate screws, worked with power that is inadequate for the purpose of propelling a balloon against a powerful wind. Perhaps the aerial machine of the future may be directed by utilizing in a thoroughly scientific manner these varying currents. In such a system of aerial locomotion, perhaps the screw may be used as a kind of makeshift in a dead calm, when a change of level is not desirable, like the oars, when there is no wind to fill the sails.

Air-routes, in the future, may be perhaps as valuable in their way as are the trade-winds in theirs. To these winds, as much as to any other factor, commerce owes much of its development. But the air-routes will not so well lend themselves to merchant princes, rather to Governments and ministerial offices. Fancy the size and cost of a balloon capable of carrying a shipload of elephants' tusks! I am also afraid that to those who consider comfort of more value than time, balloon locomotion will not commend itself; for I can assure them that some "*mal d'air*" is even worse than "*mal de mer*." But for messengers, for Cabinet Ministers when speedily summoned, and for aides-de-

camp on service, to be blown from London to Edinburgh on one side of the clouds, and to return a few feet higher on the other, all in the space of a few hours, will be an advantage recognizable, anyhow by the nation, if not by the travellers.

One of the most practical uses of balloons in war is for signalling. The utility of balloon signalling consists in the elevation obtainable. Any accepted method of signalling may be used in the car of an ordinary captive balloon—*e.g.*, flag signalling or lantern signalling. But signalling from the car of a balloon necessitates the use of a balloon of considerable size, to secure the required lifting power. This limits the practicability of such a method. About a year and a half ago it occurred to me to so apply electricity to a captive balloon, that a method of flashing signals from a balloon is practical while the operator remains on the ground. Thus the weight of the operator is obviated, and consequently the balloon can be of such a size as to be extremely portable.

In the interior of a balloon, which is made of a material that is perfectly translucent and filled with hydrogen or coal gas, are placed several incandescent electric lamps. The lamps are in metallic circuit, with a source of electricity on the ground. In the circuit on the ground is an apparatus for making and breaking contact rapidly. By varying the duration of the flashes of light in the balloon, it is possible to signal according to the Morse or any other code. A convenient size for such a signalling balloon is a capacity of some 4000 cubic feet, or, if desirable, it can be made smaller than this. Varnished cambric is a suitable material. There are two separate arrangements for suspending the lamps inside the balloon: the one consists of a holder made like a ladder, the lamps being placed one above the other in multiple arc. This arrangement is convenient, because of the small breadth of the ladder, which is easily admitted into the neck of the balloon. The ladder arrangement, however, casts a small shadow on the surface of the balloon. This is of hardly any consequence, but the existence of any shadow is obviated by using a holder in the form of a ball, from which project lamps at various angles. The form of contact-breaker which produces the intermittent flashes of light is in form somewhat like a Morse key. In reality it is essentially different. An ordinary Morse key, such as is used in telegraphy, would not withstand the large currents used to light the lamps. The contacts would be rapidly destroyed. In one form of contact-breaker there are carbon contacts. These can be easily renewed at trifling cost. In another form of contact-breaker there are rubbing contacts faced with platinum.

The leads which convey the electric current to light the lamps

must be as light as possible, consistent with the current they have to carry. It has been suggested by military authorities that such balloons would be useful for other purposes than for flashing signals—viz., as a preconcerted signal, or as a point light to guide advances or retreats.

The source of electrical power for working the lamps inside the balloon may be varied according to circumstances. It may be, (1) a small dynamo; (2) a storage battery; (3) a primary battery. Each of these three forms of electric power can be supplied in portable and convenient forms. In some cases, where there is a stationary dynamo machine in close proximity, storage cells may be conveniently used, as they can be charged from this stationary dynamo and brought into the field when required. A portable way of obtaining power would be to use a small gas engine with dynamo combined. This might be fixed on the waggon with all the other apparatus connected with the balloon; the engine would be worked by the gas, which is always a necessary adjunct to balloons. The gas supply might be a portable apparatus for generating gas, or else the method of storing gas in steel bottles could be adopted. This latter method has been carried out successfully by the Royal Engineers.

The advantages which I claim for this method of signalling are, briefly: It facilitates night signalling; it enables signalling to be carried on at great distances and in places where the ordinary methods would fail to be of use, such places as hilly and wooded districts; the apparatus is portable and simple. The invention has a short history. Shortly after its invention, some eighteen months ago, it was exhibited in model in the War Department of the Inventions Exhibition, 1885. While on exhibition there, the method was referred for Government trial under a committee of the Royal Engineers, at Chatham. During the time the model was being exhibited at South Kensington, some experiments were tried with a balloon of 4000 cubic feet capacity in the grounds of the Albert Palace. In this balloon were placed six lamps worked to sixteen or twenty candle-power. During these experiments the value of the methods for long-distance signalling was tested, the flashes of light from the balloon being observed with the naked eye as far as Uxbridge, a distance of sixteen miles. This was effected by less than 100 candle-power. The same apparatus was tried by the Government authorities at Chatham, after which trial the War Office gave an order for some of this new signalling apparatus to be supplied to the Royal Engineers. The system was again tested at Aldershot under the Signalling Department, when Major Thrupp, the Inspector of Army Signalling, arranged a series of experiments. On the day fixed for this trial there was a snowstorm and a fog,

two very unfavourable conditions for experiments in signalling ; but nevertheless the signals from the balloon were read and answered by the signallers stationed some few miles distant.

The experiments hitherto conducted have been in connection with the army, but such balloons might also be useful to the navy. Their greatest use for the navy would be for coast signalling—signalling round corners ; and it is to be hoped that before long some experiment in coast signalling will be carried out. In conclusion, perhaps, one ought to mention some particular occasion in history when this balloon-signalling would have been useful. I do not think we need look far back to find an instance. A short while ago there was a brave General shut up in a besieged city, with a few followers. Near at hand there were friends ready to help, but ignorant of the immediate necessity of their help. If from Kartoum there had arisen such an electric signalling balloon as has been described above, its flashes of light in the sky would have told the tale of the events below—a tale that would have been eagerly listened to, and perhaps Gordon would have left Kartoum, a conqueror, with his life spared for the future service of his country, that he loved so well.

ERIC STUART BRUCE.

ART. IV.—CRITICS AND CLASS-LISTS.

“COMPARISONS are odious,” is an aphorism commonly accepted—always, however, as reflection will show us, with reference to other people’s comparisons and never to our own. There are in reality few commoner signs of any sort of mental alertness than the love of comparison and classification for its own sake, the tendency to dwell on degrees of superiority and inferiority as such. We can trace its presence equally in the school-boy’s deep curiosity or still deeper conviction as to “the best” and “the next best” in the various departments of cricket ; in the Swiss tourist’s unfailing interest in realizing which peak is higher and which lower than another ; and in the national enthusiasm with which we regard a Newton or a Nelson. The affection is not easy to analyze ; but its main ingredient is, perhaps, just the primary instinct to take a side—the instinct of partisanship which comes out among the spectators of every sort of contest, and which, *e.g.*, would make ninety-nine Londoners out of a hundred, even though innocent of the remotest connection with

either of the contending universities, feel ashamed of admitting complete indifference as to the result of the annual boat-race. And in its more refined forms, where the element of hero-worship more or less enters, the instinct of comparison is really so valuable a way of adding interest to our intellectual life, that to be destitute of it may be accounted a misfortune and a proof of torpor. It quickens passive perception into active participation. A personal and emotional colouring is given to the act of judgment when one's own mind is recognized, not as a mere register, nor even as a passionless umpire, but as the sensitive and sympathetic stage on which one's heroes have actually to measure their strength and find their level, as the living and independent means through which the degrees of their excellence become distinct realities.

But like everything else which tends to a sense of one's own centrality, this habit of classification needs watching. In matters of daily intercourse we all recognize the odiousness of comparisons, when something that is moving our approbation is forced into disadvantageous contrast with something else, absent or unknown to us, the suggestion of which chills our pleasure in proportion as it warms the self-importance of the person who introduces it. And further on we may have to notice that this sort of bad manners is not wholly lacking in literary criticism. But I want now more particularly to notice another danger, one affecting not the manner but the validity of the criticism: I mean the assumption that because the justice of our classification is keenly felt, it is, therefore, demonstrable. We first attempt to give clearness and solidity to our position in our own minds by means of a formula; by entrenching our convictions behind some short and convenient canon or principle; neglecting thereby the chance that their truth, even for us, may be a very composite thing, whose strength and weight is really disposed over many points. And then, as the fact of having our own order of merit is inseparable from the impulse to convince others of its justice, and as the normal mode of convincing others of anything is by argument, we are naturally led into trying to make argument cover the ground, just as we tried to make our formula cover it; which, in turn, may involve us in the struggle to prove or confirm by argumentative methods what really belongs in large measure to the domain of instinct, and is as unamenable to reason as tastes and scents—much as though one should try to secure a sunbeam that has visited one's chamber by strengthening the floor and walls.

This danger belongs to verbal treatment of all imaginative work; but the field where it is most prominent is that of literary, and specially of poetical, criticism. In other arts, the need of a purely unreasoning faculty, of something in both producer and

percipient which cannot be put into words—an “eye for colour,” an “ear for music”—is too obvious to be for long lost sight of. Not, indeed, but that it often *is* lost sight of; but the very inadequacy of any attempts to cover in words what is the essence of the effect in these other directions acts as a sort of antidote, and would alone suffice to keep before us the radical truth. The arts present, in this connection, a natural ascending series. Music, in its abstraction and aloofness from visible and intellectual subject-matter, is naturally the one where reason soonest deserts the field; and, as a rule, the expository efforts so common in musical programmes, after telling us all that the composer had in his mind and *meant* to say, end by naïvely admitting that what concerns us is, after all, what he *did* say—to wit, a certain self-justified succession of tones, appreciable only by means of a particular faculty which knows no law but its own. A similarly independent and wholly abstract element gives meaning to such a term as “visual harmonies.” It is the exclusive source of pleasure in the pattern of the sporting handkerchief, so humorously depicted by Mr. Ruskin; and it has a vague but large share in the pleasure of architectural combinations. But not only are the principles of proportion here more describable than in music, but there begins to be a large infusion of a more concrete element; and the author just named has nowhere used words with more persuasive truth and eloquence than in tracing the subtle but still penetrable affinities between features of buildings and the human life which they encompass. Still passing on in the direction of the concrete, we come to plastic and pictorial art, where the presence of visible and independently comprehensible subject-matter gives words a far larger chance—a chance too of being used in the wrong direction as well as in the right; so that against Mr. Ruskin’s lessons of truthful and loving scrutiny of nature, drawn from the demonstrable presence or absence of it in the work of particular men, we have to set the irritation of criticism like Lessing’s, when he elaborately supplies us with reasons why we cannot help admiring works which we perhaps do not admire at all, or argues out his evidences of consummate plastic imagination from points of treatment which might have occurred to any blind child of ordinary intelligence. But it is naturally when we come to Poetry—the art which deals not only with visible aspects of life, but with all life, with the whole sphere of the concrete, and not only has this as its subject, but has words themselves as its material—that verbal exposition finds its freest scope. Here it is that reasoned criticism will go furthest towards covering the field; and in proportion to the extent which it really will cover, and to the amount of excellent and illuminating work that it can do and has done, is the danger

that the part which it will not cover, the part which, like the essence of Music, cannot be explained or argued about, will be ignored. Even the admission of its existence in a passing phrase will be apt to remain a dead letter. It is with difficulty that the critic who feels that he has to fight, and that Reason is his sole weapon, can avoid language implying that in wielding it he is dealing with the whole, instead of a part only of the artistic results which he appraises.

And nowhere does either the impulse towards argumentative criticism, or the limit of its efficiency, appear so clearly as in that point of comparison and classification with which we started, and by which a good half of poetical controversy is animated and dominated. For were reason able to provide us with assured canons, free from all taint of idiosyncrasy, from which orders of poetical merit might be conclusively deduced, we should surely by now have seen some signs of agreement as to their authority. How much agreement has Reason produced?

Consider the controversy which is absolutely perennial in private debates on literary subjects, and which some three or four years ago engaged the pens of such doughty champions that it may take its place as a classical instance of ineradicable literary differences—the controversy as to the relative greatness of the three most conspicuous English poets of the early part of this century. Of three critics of the highest rank who entered the lists in this dispute, each made a different classification. Mr. Matthew Arnold's order is Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley; Mr. Alfred Austin's is Byron, Wordsworth, Shelley; Mr. Swinburne's is Shelley, Wordsworth, Byron, the two latter being perhaps bracketed, on the view that Wordsworth's great achievements were the higher in quality but the less in amount. Each order would find other powerful advocates. I imagine, for instance, that Mr. Ruskin would agree with Mr. Austin, and Mr. Symonds with Mr. Swinburne, while not a few would place Wordsworth first and Shelley second. Probably every one who takes a serious interest in poetry has his order, and would be ready to give some reasons for it. Let us glance at some of the reasons that have been lately given.

Mr. Swinburne's reasons are rather stated in impressive language than developed in any systematic way. They are, briefly, that Wordsworth was tainted with Philistinism, and that Byron could not sing; while it is assumed without question or argument that Shelley (besides being free from Philistinism, and outsingings nearly every one) was one of the few prophets, as contrasted with the many pleasure-givers, among poets. But the other two critics have both striven hard to universalize their faith. The standard on which Mr. Arnold bases his estimate has

become famous. It is "criticism of life;" that is what he holds literature, and Poetry as the highest branch of literature, to be essentially concerned with. And he has little difficulty in showing that Wordsworth's criticism of life was, on the whole, a truer and healthier one than Byron's, while Shelley hardly criticized life at all. Then comes Mr. Austin, and in two very striking and suggestive papers opposes Mr. Arnold's position. By dint of rigorously confining "criticism" to the meaning of *passing judgment*, he in turn has little difficulty in showing that, of the great poets of the world, some have not passed judgments at all, and others have passed judgments in which the advance of society has shown the most serious limitations. Some of Mr. Austin's subsidiary contentions scarcely seem so strong. For instance, he objects that "to make the relative greatness of a poet depend upon the healthfulness and truth of his criticism of life, is to place the estimate of his poetry at the mercy of the opinion of anybody and everybody as to what is a true and healthy criticism of life, about which no consensus exists"—a *reductio ad absurdum* which surely has no force unless through a totally unwarranted assumption that there exists some transcendental estimate of Poetry to which every individual not only should but will conform. The fact that persons differ as to what is the true criticism of life no more affects Mr. Arnold's canon, no more precludes him from holding that there is a true criticism of life as opposed to an untrue, and that the greater poet gives the truer criticism, than the fact that many call evil good and good evil precludes him from holding that there is a right and wrong in conduct, and that the greater teacher points out the better way. But as regards Mr. Austin's main objection, Mr. Arnold, I imagine, would say that its force rests wholly on the restricted meaning assigned to the word "criticism;" that that word may fairly claim to include any examination or interpretation of life which clears our views and enlarges our knowledge of it, even though no judgment be explicitly passed *ab extra*; and that in this way Shakespeare, whom Mr. Austin represents as never having criticized life, might be considered as one of its greatest critics, and even one of its greatest moral interpreters; and, indeed, must be so considered, unless Mr. Austin would push his assertion of Shakespeare's objective and impartial treatment of human phenomena to the point of maintaining that we rise from his works in precisely the same emotional attitude towards Iago and Desdemona, and passing precisely similar judgments on Cordelia's conduct and Goneril's.

Probably, however, "criticism" did need to have its province more clearly defined; and there can be no doubt that, in opposing to it his own standard—objective *representation* of life—and

estimating poets by the amount of life they have represented, Mr. Austin has suggested much of what might be found lacking in the other standard. But he, in turn, illustrates the danger of putting all one's eggs into one basket, and making a single canon of excellence bear the burden of all the comparative estimates which we can or should make of poets. He gives a very eloquent account of the ideal objective poet—the poet with the most catholic and impersonal sympathies and the greatest absence of private prepossessions; and then, as a proof that such an account must exhibit the one standard by which poetical achievement should be judged, he thinks it enough to say, "Is it not true of Shakespeare?" forgetting that it is every whit as much *untrue* of another poet whose fame can certainly not be said to be lower or less deserved than Shakespeare's—of Dante. However much Dante represented the life of his age, he did so from an intensely subjective and critical standpoint, and his individual character is as prominent in his artistic work as Shakespeare's is the reverse. Nor is this the case merely in respect of his character as a patriot, or an exile, or a religious or political partisan, or even a worshipper of ideal love; he reveals more wholly personal traits than any of these heads would imply. Take as an instance the exquisite courtesy, for its delicacy almost unique in literature, which prompts him to open his address to the blinded company in Purgatory with the words, "O gente sicura di veder l' alto lume," or which made him just before refuse even to glance at the sufferers who could not see him in return, feeling the respect due from man to man to be such that merely a look, merely a passing exhibition of interest and excitement in misfortune which we are powerless to aid, is a sort of wrong, an "*oltraggio*," something consciously won by us out of others' pain. If things like this exemplify, in Mr. Arnold's words, "the noble and profound application to life of ideas which the poet has acquired for himself," and if it is on things like this that much of our special love for Dante's poetry depends, we can hardly accept as complete or unique a canon which would make a poet great in proportion as such ideas are kept out of sight.

We need not pursue further this specimen of a controversy which might well be endless. Everybody may learn something from the reasonings of those who differ from him on such a subject; but is there nothing else to learn? When Goethe's youthful companions were engrossed each with the conviction that his own school essay was the best, Goethe alone had self-detachment enough to grasp the incident as a whole, and to see the lesson of all these incompatible convictions. And might not critics of Poetry learn more than they do from the great primary fact that these differences exist? For it is difficult to imagine

any meaning for the "greatness" of a poet, or any canon whereby it might be sought to assert objective rightness for a particular classification of poets, which would not *pro tanto* be invalidated by the fact that a considerable number of persons, similarly interested in the subject, and sincere admirers of all the candidates, adopt with equal assurance a quite different classification. At any rate, if there be any such esoteric meanings and canons, they find no place in ordinary criticism, which seems always to use "greatness" and the degrees of the adjective "great" with a certain reference, understood if not expressed, to the general verdict. The critic is not content with giving reasons why so and so is great, greater, or greatest, but speaks as if this is a truth which must prevail in the world at large. And so strong is this instinct of faith that even the serious discordance of view here and now leaves it undisturbed; the critic merely shifts the arena, and teaches us to look for the really authoritative verdict elsewhere and hereafter. The rival muses are to find their Paris in the voice of posterity or in the judgment of foreigners. One may doubt, however, whether this appeal can be really meant to be taken as altogether final. Even supposing foreigners to remain for ever blind to the peculiar magic of Wordsworth (which, I think, is likely), or if, in the year 1900, there are as many English dissentients as there would be now from the view that he is the greatest English poet of the century (which, I think, is by no means improbable), I hardly think that Mr. Arnold would abandon his own opinion on the subject. And if this be so, surely the actual discordance of view might suggest something else than the projection of the ideal unanimity into future and dubious regions. It might at least suggest that the mistake has lain in over-simplification, and that the field of dispute has been unduly narrowed, and that the actual competition between the poets, on the arena of men's minds, is something larger than a competition between two or three compact principles.

But it suggests more than this. It suggests the pervading importance of some element in a poet's work which a critic cannot elucidate, or bring into relation with the various debatable aspects of intellectual and emotional life, and which he is powerless, therefore, to make others share—an element of beauty lying beyond the scope of knowledge, even of emotional and imaginative knowledge. This latter knowledge includes, of course, much of what is poetically beautiful, so that I am urging no such truism as that to know and to enjoy are different things. My point is one which, if it be despised as a truism, is often ignored as a truth—namely, that any poetry which we love in the most characteristic way, which is for us poetry *par excellence*, contains for us another quite distinct sort of beauty, the perception

of which stands outside any relations of fact which it is now in our power to define, and must therefore be accepted as a matter of irreverible taste and instinct. Now, it is a well-known characteristic of convictions resting on taste and instinct that our feeling of their being normal, and such as others must somehow or other share, is strong almost in proportion to its blindness and lack of logical standpoint. In discussions on questions of taste we may perpetually observe, both in ourselves and others, an eagerness to establish our view such as we seldom experience in matters which are accurately demonstrable. So that both that tendency to appeal to the general verdict, and that personal sense of rightness independent of it, on which we have remarked, may be taken as signs of this elusive element in poetical work. And even the critic who is most earnest in assigning to poets their rank according to the rational importance and scope of the things they have said would never, I must maintain, have thought of arguing for that as their *poetical* rank, had not some portions of their work been pervaded for him by a quality quite impenetrable to his arguments; nor can I for a moment imagine that, if either Mr. Arnold or Mr. Austin should by his reasonings convert the other on the question as to what is the prime reasonable canon of excellence, such conversion would bring about any *bonâ fide* change of classification. To the luckless reader, at any rate, who finds himself assenting to each side in turn, it will bring satisfaction to believe that the order of merit was not in either case deduced by the application of the standard, but had been a strong reality in the critic's mind long before his standard was evolved to justify it, and that the difference in the orders of merit may well mean, not that either standard is wrong, but that both are incomplete; while there is nothing unreasonable in their incompatibility, if what is needed to complete them is an element essentially unamenable to reason.

I have said that some phrase admitting an element which cannot be discussed usually occurs in the course of poetical discussion. Thus Mr. Arnold tells us that the criticism of life, which the poet applies to his subject, is applied "under the conditions immutably fixed by the laws of poetic beauty and poetic truth." This phrase is certainly wide enough to include any and every element; but also vague enough to leave us uncertain what exactly it is meant to include. It does not necessarily mean more than that "L'Assommoir," which (if we allow to criticism the extended sense above suggested) undeniably criticizes more life more truly than "Paradise Lost," would not, when hitched into Alexandrines, make a superior poem. From Mr. Arnold's treatment of Byron's metrical flaws, however, we may certainly gather that he

includes metrical accuracy among his conditions ; but even here, where he comes nearest to what is wanted, he leaves us quite uncertain as to how deep he considers that point to go—*e.g.*, whether he holds that Byron's rank could have been established had such flaws been perpetually prominent in all his work. Nor in his essay on Wordsworth does he even recur to the above phrase as though it contained a vital point, but rests his whole advocacy on purely rational grounds ; and he has written sentences which tend to show that he would oppose any attempt to set excellence in respect of any magical or non-reasonable element in the balance against excellence of the reasonable and debateable kind. For he says that he ranks Wordsworth above Leopardi, in spite of what he holds Leopardi's superiority as an artist—and this, whatever else it includes, beyond doubt includes our non-reasonable element—on account of the superiority of Wordsworth's criticism of life ; and says it in such a way as to imply that, if we agree with him on this latter point, the poetic superiority is incontestable. Again, he says that Wordsworth "left a body of poetical work superior in power, in interest, in the qualities which give enduring freshness" to that of any poet (Goethe excepted) of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries ; but in expanding this view he dwells wholly on points in Wordsworth's poems which represent his attitude to life and nature, and which can thus be made matter of interesting discussion. He does not recognize among these "qualities which give enduring freshness" any element before which the critic must stand helpless and discussion cease.

Mr. Austin does explicitly recognize the existence of such an element ; for he quotes passages of verse to exemplify what is and what is not poetry, and confesses that the difference defies analysis ; that he knows when the verse *is* poetry, but not how it comes to be poetry. And this element, which he cannot isolate or analyze, he describes as that which turns representation into transfiguration, and he identifies it with imagination. "Poetry," he says, "is an imaginative representation, in verse or rhythm, of whatever men perceive, feel, think, or do." Now here I cannot help demurring to the looseness of the word "imaginative," for it is naturally and truly applied to a great deal of work in prose ; and between such prose and poetry, the only difference left, according to Mr. Austin's definition, would be that the latter is in rhythm ; whence it would follow that if such prose were turned into verse, by a mere rearrangement of the verbal material in which it is presented, it would necessarily become genuine poetry—a conclusion which I think that no one on reflection could accept. But perhaps the most direct evidence of the defect of Mr. Austin's, no less than Mr. Arnold's, treatment

may be found in the constant *untranslatable*ness of the best poetry; for this most distinctive mark of the non-reasonable element in Poetry, as I conceive it, their canons and definitions seem to leave absolutely no room. It is not only that they supply no grounds why any one of the numerous good verse-translations, in which the sense of a fine poem is irreproachably rendered, should fall far short of the original in the impression it is able to produce, but that if their account were sufficient, this indisputable fact would have no existence. I must hold, therefore, that even Mr. Austin's account is insufficient, and that this non-reasonable element has constituents and conditions which demand far more distinct recognition. Granting it to be the result of spontaneous genius which is wholly beyond analysis, and repudiating any idea of accounting for it in the sense of obtaining rules for its production—even as we resign the hope of analyzing the life of a living body and of building it up in a laboratory, we can still, I think, carry analysis to such a point as will seriously weaken Mr. Austin's definition, and indeed any definition, regarded as a canon for producing unanimity in our comparative estimates of poetry.

I can justify this view here only by taking the first step in the analysis, which happens, however, to be the most important of all, though its result is rather to show what the element is *not* than what it *is*. The almost universal habit of those who recognize its existence is to treat it as having only one constituent, and to identify it with the purely musical or sensory element in verse. There is a great temptation to adopt this treatment, in that it gives the matter a look of simplicity and avoids all cross-divisions. The purely musical element in Poetry, the part which appeals exclusively to the ear, and represents and depends on nothing outside itself, stands out in clear and unmistakable contrast to the part which appeals exclusively to the intellect, and which depends on an external world of material and spiritual facts; and a well-recognized distinction of language marks the former as the simply presentative, even as it marks the latter as the representative element. How convenient, therefore, to assume that the element in Poetry which so enormously affects our estimate of it, while still baffling our analysis and defying our arguments, is none other than this musical or presentative element; which, in the very fact that its appeal is to a bodily sense and does not represent or depend on anything outside itself, reveals the ground why we cannot further analyze it or argue about it. And a superficial glance at the other arts will seem to confirm such a view. For Music, the art in which we find that beauty and the greater and less of it most completely baffle analysis and defy argument, is also the very type of a presenta-

tive art; and in the case of Painting and Sculpture, where, though much in them admits of analysis and argument, we are constantly constrained to recognize a beauty beyond the reach of either, it is again easy and plausible to ascribe this quality to the forms and colours regarded as abstract presentations—*i.e.*, as taken in abstraction from what they represent, and presented to the organ of vision on its own and their own account. This easy way with the arts is, however, as misleading as it is convenient. I have tried elsewhere to show how vain it is to suppose that, in looking at the representative forms of Painting and Sculpture, we can make any *bond fide* abstraction of their representative nature, and enjoy their contours in absolute unconsciousness that a marble man means a man, and a painted tree a tree; and that, this being so, the beauty of such forms, even where it is most baffling, can never be truly independent of their character as representations, and must always have its roots in subtle and, perhaps, infinitely remote associations with the objects and facts of the outside world. The comparison of Poetry with Music gives, perhaps, more excuse for error; for it is (or should be) so plain that the essence of beauty in Music cannot be proved or discussed in terms of reason, and also that there is an essential element in Poetry which, like Music, is addressed to the ear and is even habitually designated by the adjective “musical,” that the impulse is at first irresistible to regard that part of poetical beauty which we find ourselves unable to prove or discuss in terms of reason as nothing more or less than this “musical” element.

That it really is something more may, however, be shown by the very simplest experiments. For this musical or presentative element in verse should clearly produce its most unmixed and unmistakable effect on ears which are not further serving as organs for the understanding, and to which the words are mere sounds conveying no ideas or images. This condition is satisfied by the ears of any one who listens to verse in a language which he does not understand; and to make the experiment conclusive, we ought of course to take persons of sensitive ear, as shown by their being keenly alive to the pleasure of good verse in languages which they do understand. A very few trials will reveal how extremely slight and how rapidly tired of is the pleasure which this exclusive appeal to the ear can really produce; and, further, how little its amount in different cases corresponds with the verdicts of a person familiar with the language. Masterpieces of verbal “music” will not be picked out from quite ordinary verses; and quite ordinary verses, read with unction and sonority, will readily be taken on trust as masterpieces. The amount of æsthetic impression producible in a Frenchman, ignorant of

English, by Lord Tennyson's best blank verse, may not exceed the amount that he would obtain from a sonorous reading of an article in the *Times*, and will probably fall decidedly short of what he would experience from many a rhyming jingle; and to a Greek ear it is probable that even German hexameters, strongly scanned, would have seemed preferable to the stateliest Alexandrines.

Every one must, I think, allow how impossible it is that the full delight of Poetry, as distinct from imaginative prose, should result from the mere addition of this faint, monotonous, sensory pleasure, to the totally different imaginative pleasure produced by the meaning of the words. But a still more direct proof is possible, if we carefully examine the nature of the change made when poetry has been stripped of its musical element. What I am urging is so little likely to be fully realized from mere abstract-looking sentences, and depends for its effect so entirely on immediate subjection to experiment, that I may be excused for suggesting a definite instance; though such a course involves the disadvantage that I can but select a passage which happens to have for me personally, and for some others may not have, the poetical character in high perfection. For those others, of course, the experiment could only be satisfactorily made through the selection, by each, of one or two passages which have the same character for him. However, there will perhaps be no very wide complaint of the selection of the finest stanza in what many hold to be Wordsworth's finest poem, the "Ode to Duty":—

Stern Law-giver ! yet Thou dost wear
 The Godhead's most benignant grace ;
 Nor know we anything so fair
 As is the smile upon Thy face :
 Flowers laugh before Thee on their beds,
 And fragrance in Thy footing treads ;
 Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong,
 And the most ancient heavens, through Thee, are fresh and strong.

Let the third and fourth lines be rendered, "Nor do we know anything so fair as the smile on thy face." All will grant that, while the meaning of the sentence for the understanding remains identical, its total effect has been changed, and changed for the worse. Now the alternative is that the change either does or does not extend beyond a change in the sensuous impressions made by the flow of sound on the ear. Any one who maintains that it does *not* so extend is committed to the following assertion:—That his complete pleasure in the sentence has been diminished *only* by the amount of the fall in pleasure which he

will experience if a sentence of poetry in a language unknown to him is read over, first in its proper metrical form, and then in a prose version. And as we have found this amount to be extremely small, the assertion implies that Wordsworth's couplet gives him scarcely more pleasure than my prose version of it. If that is his real experience, there is an end of the matter as regards him; one can but believe that he is in a small minority, and whether he is or not, the difference of result in the case of even one other person would be a fact that nobody could get behind or upset.

What has obscured the true state of the case is, beyond question, the connotation of the word "music," suggesting, as it cannot but do, a pleasure which is far more than sensory and the very reverse of faint and monotonous; so that we easily and vaguely regard the "musical element" in Poetry as constituting a vast independent source of delight, and as adding to the delight from other sources an amount immensely beyond what proves to be its actual capacity. All the more important is it to observe the poverty of this source on its own account, and to note how radically delusive is the comparison with music proper, treated in any other way than as a contrast. The extent of the misconception is shown in all sorts of ways. Nothing, for instance, is commoner than to hear it remarked as a strange fact that So-and-so should take such a delight in verse and yet not care for music. I am not referring to the fashionable habit of regarding all the arts as One, or all as forms of Poetry, or any such vague verbal jugglery; but to the definite idea that an ear which can appreciate verse ought, *ipso facto*, to be what is called a musical ear, an ear which will appreciate music. Were this so, the "strange fact" would, of course, be not so much strange as impossible. It is really about as strange as that a person who likes milk-puddings should be indifferent to milk-punch, or *vice versa*. Verse and Music have one element in common, an element of measured rhythm or time-regularity in the order of sounds, most broadly and shortly expressed as regularity of recurrence. Music consists in the fusion of an order of this sort with an order of another sort—that of sounds in respect of pitch. Consequently no amount of perception of rhythm or time-order will help a person to appreciate music, unless his ear is also sensitive to the other order, in the sense of instinctively perceiving the distances and pitch-relations of the notes that compose it. This gift of "a musical ear," though even the perfection of it is very common, is by no means universal; and it is as totally unconnected with any other mental or bodily attribute as long sight. Even this brief description of it will suffice to show both how an ear may be (as it frequently is) at once delicately sensitive

to the charm of verse-effects and inappreciative of music ;* and also why the satisfaction obtainable from sounds ordered by rhythm only—as in a performance on the drum, or in verse as tested by presentation in an unknown tongue—must be infinitely slight in comparison with the complete pleasure obtainable from Music.

It may possibly be objected that in this latter conclusion I am overlooking certain artistic elements in the sound of verse beyond the rhythmic—namely, alliteration and skilful arrangement of vowel-sounds. But immensely as these elements often contribute to the total effect of good verse, experiments with a person ignorant of the language will again show how inconspicuous and uncertain is any abstract effect that they are capable of producing on the ear. Thus tested, the amount of pleasure which the artistic introduction of them in verse will add to the sensuous impression producible by the reading of ordinary prose, or of verse in which no such special art has been employed, will prove to be a negligible quantity.

It seems, then, quite impossible to hold that the marked difference of effect between imaginative verse and imaginative prose should be accounted for by the mere addition of the ear-pleasure of the sound to the mind-pleasure of the sense, and to regard the complete message of poetry as just the sum of these two pleasures. Equally impossible is it to doubt that the presence

* A word must be said here about the difference between Poetry and Music, even in respect of the metrical element whose fundamental principle is common to both ; and about the total irrelevance to music of any delicate verbal melody, and the strange absurdity of representing (as M. de Banville does) ability to be sung as “*la condition indispensable et première de toute poésie*,” or asserting (as Dr. Hueffer does) the “identity of musical and metrical laws.” Dr. Hueffer, by good luck, implicitly refutes himself by the remainder of his own sentence. ‘That identity, he says, was fully understood by Dante, “who was what every lyrical poet by rights should be—a musician.”’ Consequently, not a single modern lyricist of eminence has been “what by rights he should be,” and we are left to lament the barbarous harshness of Goethe’s, Shelley’s, Victor Hugo’s, Lord Tennyson’s, and Mr. Swinburne’s best verses. The idea that musical setting is the authoritative test of the true verbal flow is a singular instance of the way in which an imposing-looking doctrine will override the most obvious facts. The difference between music and poetry, which the vapours of modern criticism constantly strive to conceal in the higher atmosphere of transcendental æsthetics, extends as far down even as this mundane and structural feature of rhythm. Not indeed to the very bottom of it. We have seen that the fundamental principle of regular recurrence, of a scheme of regular accents, is common to both arts ; though, I may add, it is just this common principle that the school who are most determined to make out that the two arts are one, are, by an odd perversity, the first to ignore—the “*oneness*” being apparently more obvious to them in pieces of un-metrical “*declamation*” than in pieces of formed and straightforward song. But in all that supervenes on that common principle the difference may be complete.

of this sound-element is essential to the total effect. We are thus driven to recognize that the effect is in some way not a *sum* but a *product* of its elements ; so that if we reckon the imaginative pleasure alone as 100, and the sound-pleasure alone as 5, the resulting pleasure is not 105, but 500. But perhaps the better metaphor is that of chemical combination. If I seem to dwell on the point pedantically, it is because this sort of combination, this veritable *psycho-chemistry*, in which the nature of the constituents as known in separation is quite transformed by their mutual re-action, is a fact not enough recognized in psychology ; and the cases where it occurs may well be noted and marked off from the very common cases where impressions are simply summed, as, for instance, when I eat my dinner at a window commanding a fine view.

This, then, is the first result of our inquiry into the constitution of the non-reasonable element in Poetry. And it at once brings out a grave defect even in Mr. Austin's sound-looking definition of the art, as "a transfiguration or imaginative representation of life in verse or rhythm." For if this does not say, it assuredly implies, that the rhythmic qualities lie outside the imaginative qualities, and are superposed on them ; it suggests no sort of reaction or interaction, producing quite new qualities. But the gist of the matter is that the imagination, or the transfiguring power of what is most genuinely Poetry, cannot be at all completely judged apart from the actual rhythmic presentation ; that the union of the elements goes to the very root of the imaginative process ; that the essential difference between the most imaginative prose writer (who is nothing more) and the imaginative poet is not a technical one, not a matter of a more or less striking mode of presentation for their ideas, but extends to the nature of the imagination itself, and to the inmost essence of the things it finds to tell us. For however much common ground there may be to the two, the imagination of the genuine poet has always the distinctive quality that images and ideas perpetually spring up in it not only demanding rhythmic expression—though that is true, and that is much—but actually clothed, or rather embodied, in rhythm. Not of course at first in all the amplitude of their rhythmic life, nor in any very prolonged flow—that is a piece of luck for now and then, luck, however, of the sort that only comes to one who deserves it—but in phrases that, flashing at once into their place in the metrical scheme, light up the path for others to follow : in word-fragments and line fragments, which, even before they come in sight of their ultimate combination, are yearning and struggling towards it, and, even as they enter their diviner's mind, are instinct with the presage of the fuller glory to which they tend. But it is

doubly useless, in a case where the complete result, which we can all sit and contemplate, defies adequate description, to beat about for words to describe the shifting and subtle processes that lead up to it.

And here for the present I must stop short. The recognition of the above peculiarity in the combination of "sound and sense" may also go far to suggest its close connection with varieties in the impressions received, and therefore in the estimates made by different persons. I can only ask the reader to believe that this connection could be made clear, were it possible here to carry out the analysis into detail. It would thus be shown that the non-reasonable element is *par excellence* the inconstant and subjective factor in Poetry. And to complete my view of its æsthetic position, I should further have to show its bearing on two other large topics—the relation of a man's native language to his appreciation of Poetry, and the validity and mode of application to Poetry of the test of popularity. But I must dismiss a discussion which would more than double the length of my paper, and devote my few remaining pages to another topic, which could not be omitted without still more obvious incompleteness. Suppose the limitations of reasoning criticism to be agreed to. Suppose it granted that reasonable grounds may very well suffice to class for us Milton and Southey, or Shakespeare and Addison; but hardly Byron and Shelley, or Rossetti and Browning. It may still be asked—Does the critic really produce no effect beyond that of reasoned exposition? Is his influence wholly limited to the ground which his logical advocacy covers? To assert this would be greatly to underrate his functions; what he cannot do by argument he can most assuredly often do by *infection*—by the contagious influence on the minds of others of a more vivid view and a more concentrated pleasure. It is easy to disparage this sort of unreasoned influence as producing a second-hand and vicarious admiration, which cannot have the genuineness of the original article. But such disparagement seems very shallow. The effect is not that the influenced person consciously exerts himself to see or hear with the eyes or ears of another, but that, his attention being sympathetically fascinated, the electric contact (so to speak) is made for him, and his own eyes and ears are brought steadily to bear on beauties which they might otherwise have passed over. Surely we must all have had this brought home to us again and again even through the simplest of all means, that of quotation. A passage standing out alone, put forward by some one as what to him at any rate has been peculiarly or characteristically impressive, will often get from that mere fact a new sort of place in our regard, and will strike us, when we meet it again in its place, with quite a new air of distinction.

But the effect may go much beyond this. It is impossible to gainsay the testimony of those who find themselves now cherishing in the inmost sanctuary of their imagination, and brooding over with intensest personal affection, some treasure to which (even though it may have crossed their mental field of vision a score of times) access was first opened to them through the sheer reality of another's enthusiasm. Even on that non-reasonable and intuitive ground where there can be no definite instruction, and where it is supposed that the individual must do what he can with such instincts as nature has conferred on him, our lives are curiously intertwined with those of others; and for most of us the relation is really a very loose one between the amount which our emotional self proves able to contain and assimilate, and the amount which its unassisted feelers would suffice to supply to it. And this mutual helpfulness assumes quite unprecedented importance in an age like the present, when the multiplicity and dispersion of interests and pursuits makes systematic study of art or literature an impossibility to all but a small minority, and when the amount that a man may pick up by the way greatly depends on his alertness to be helped into quick *rapprochement* with the best that he can get.

And Poetry is, beyond doubt, the imaginative region where this contagious influence is most effective. Here, again, as in so many other ways, Music and Poetry, the two arts of the ear whose exceptional opportunities of union has led to a superstition as to their fundamental unity, occupy the two extremes of the scale. Music is, of course, unequalled as the art in the simultaneous appreciation of which numbers can unite, enhancing their enjoyment by so doing, and adding to its dignity by realization of its social aspect. But here the power to appreciate, and the immediate susceptibility to the impression, are pre-supposed: the sympathy comes in as an augmentative, not as a revealing, influence. The essential impression of a musical sentence, apart from all extraneous associations, is a simple thing, is a thing as it were all of one piece, to be dwelt on in one way by the concentration on it of a quite independent and unique faculty. It may be pleasing to one musical hearer, displeasing or indifferent to another; but its simplicity and independence give it a hit-or-miss character. On sufficient acquaintance it either speaks or it does not speak; and the brooding over it on account of another's enthusiasm about it will hardly prove a means whereby latent potentialities of feeling about it are awakened into activity. It is in virtue of just the opposite characteristics in a poetical passage that the opposite result is produced. It is a complex, often even a Protean thing, and derives its character from, it may be, numerous strains of associations, playing through verbal and

rhythmic combinations that seem to put on new aspects under our very eyes. Hence the constant chance of latent common ground, the chance that the inspiring shock of sympathy with another's enthusiasm will supervene on elements of idea and emotion which were only waiting for that shock to crystallize into the fullest and most characteristic poetical impression.

But to return to the influence itself: it is emphatically one which can never be brought to bear without tact and self-command in the expression of preferences. Just in proportion as we are ready to be infected with an intuitional delight, for which reasons cannot be assigned, are we resentful at having it thrust down our throats as a dogma. And such an offence in respect of matters of taste and instinct is far more trying than that basing of verdicts on grounds bound to be inadequate which was discussed before. Mr. Swinburne is here the most prominent offender, simply because his magnificent powers and his wonderfully vivid and delicate sense of beauty give him in this direction the most exceptional opportunities. As a critic he is never guilty of overlooking the non-reasonable element in verse. So profoundly impressed is he with the literal magic of the best poetry, that his remarks are even overapt to run rather into elaborately worded descriptions of what pleases him than into such reasoned discussion as Mr. Arnold's or Mr. Austin's. We have almost a surfeit of poems "fresh as dawn and fine as air," or "sovereignly faultless in form and colour of verse," or with "the odour and colour of cloudless air;" of "ardent affluence of colour and strenuous dilation of spirit," "sweet and sovereign oppression of absolute beauty," "sweet and sovereign unity of perfect spirit and sense," "sovereignty of language and strong grasp of spirit," "solid and flawless excellence of jewels and setting," "abysses of luminous sound and sonorous light," and so on. Still there is amply enough of what is true and beautiful in most of his descriptions to make it clear that he has a genuine *métier*, less as a reasoning than as an infectious critic. By what fatality, then, does he introduce at every turn expressions that inevitably awake an impulse of resistance? Why, instead of trusting his own persuasive powers, does he so constantly adopt the attitude of a man who is sure to be attacked, and who must, therefore, entrench himself every moment behind the very strongest words, so as to frighten or stultify his imaginary assailants beforehand? And in all this, it is our old friend, or enemy, the instinct of classification, which is chiefly responsible. To possess this instinct in an altogether morbid degree is specially unfortunate for a critic who belongs, or should belong, to the infectious class. In spite of his disowning all desire "to wrangle for the precedence of this immortal or of that," orders of merit of

one kind or another, expressed or implied, literally bristle on his pages, representing in literature the social offence which has earned for comparisons as a class their familiar attendant epithet. As introduced by him, every case of excellence seems to come before us staggering under the weight of its relations to other cases; we never lose the feeling that it is being backed against something else, or something else against it; that some act of fealty is being demanded of it or for it; and though Mr. Swinburne is the last man deliberately to dwarf any greatness that he recognizes, we tire of the way in which authors are hurried off, on any pretence, to make their genuflexions before one or another of his gods. In his company we lose the power of admiring our heroes directly and naturally; from the free citizenship of an intellectual republic we and they seem to pass to the slavery of a hierarchy, in which the rank of everybody and everything is as precisely assigned as in the ritual of some eastern religion, and no one can walk for bowings and scrapings. The very mention of a poet, or of a poem, seems to imply for him a sense of their place, accurately fixed by a combative examiner, in about twenty different triposes. So great is the air of exactitude which, with the turn of a phrase, Mr. Swinburne can give to his class-lists, and so multifarious are the aspects and qualities in respect of which works and workers are classed, that the reader's endeavours to adjust his judgment resembles a perpetual process of pulling and wrenching. Nor can one ever be sure when one is at the end of this Procrustean process. One never knows what new department of excellence may not at any moment crop up, in which some poet will turn out to be "out of all sight or comparison" superior to all his compeers, except, "of course," this, that, or the other of them. Gentler methods would surely be in every way an advantage; for this exaggeration of positiveness and detailed precision in undemonstrable matters not only weakens the force of the judgments, by suggesting that they would never have been thus pronounced had not their author felt that they were bound to be differed from, but actually prompts the difference. Mr. Swinburne has himself remarked on the falseness of the verdicts which great artists have not infrequently passed on one another; and in so doing he has admitted, as completely as his general tone denies, the justice of our main conclusion, that even among "capable articulate creatures" there is a large amount of *necessary* divergence of intuition in Poetry. But our argument will yield a further corollary of which he, of all others, should reap the benefit—namely, that one who at any point perceives and enjoys more than others, establishes a claim not so much to be differed from as envied by them. This truth, which lies at the very root of the infectious influence of mind on

mind, might perhaps help most of us here and there to a slight though salutary lift in each other's estimation; but Mr. Swinburne in particular, should he realize it, might make his wonderful range of poetic insight and sympathy contribute almost as much to our admiration of him as (what he cares far more about) our admiration for the many objects of his generous and enthusiastic praise. And the first condition—to give the key-note of this paper its final due—would be to strike a pen through nine out of every ten of his comparatives and superlatives.

EDMUND GURNEY.

ART. V.—THE CHURCH AFTER THE CONQUEST.

Rerum Britannicarum Medii Ævi Scriptores: Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia, et Opuscula duo de Vita Sancti Anselmi et quibusdam Miraculis ejus. Edited from Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. By MARTIN RULE, M.A. 1884. (Rolls Publications.)

SOCIETIES formed for the publication of books have been very numerous in this country, and have done good service, but it may perhaps be said without offence or exaggeration that none of them have done so much as the Masters of the Rolls have done. Private efforts, aided only by private subscriptions, cannot compete with a publisher who has access to Her Majesty's Treasury, and who cares nothing whether he sells his books or not. He can always obtain the services of able men who understand their business, and whose work when done is a credit not only to themselves, but also to the state which, through the Masters of the Rolls, employs them.

The history of St. Anselm by Eadmer, with which we have now to deal, has been entrusted to Mr. Rule, the admirable biographer of the saint. Nothing could be more fitting; and he has executed his task with that laborious and conscientious diligence so conspicuous and so charming in his "Life of St. Anselm."

Eadmer was one of the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, brought up from childhood in the cloister, and finally one of the companions of St. Anselm, the archbishop. He is a recorder of the things he saw, and of the words he heard, and of the anxieties he felt. His perfect honesty and sincerity are visible in his writings, and there is no trace of exaggeration in them. He has

supplied us with information about the Church of England after the Conquest which is of the very highest importance, and which, when well considered, makes us wonder, not at the Reformation under Henry VIII., but at its delay in coming.

William the Conqueror, when he landed on the coast of Sussex, found everything in confusion, for Harold was as much a usurper as he was a conqueror. The civil state was bad, but the ecclesiastical state was worse. The Witenagemote had taken upon itself the responsibility of governing the Church; it had deposed the Archbishop of Canterbury because he was a Norman, and had put in his place a dependant of Harold—Stigand, who, greedy and ambitious, went from Winchester to Canterbury, and held the two Sees together. It was his pleasure also to sell the abbeys. The Pope would not recognize him, and had ordered the restoration of the expelled primate. Stigand persisted in the usurpation, and having first used the pallium of the exiled prelate, obtained one from the Antipope, who no doubt was glad enough to secure the Archbishop of Canterbury for the schism he had made. This usurpation of the See of Canterbury was a cause of grave disorder, and disturbed the jurisdiction of the Church; for on the vacancies of the suffragan Sees it was difficult to fill them, since the Archbishop of Canterbury, as natural legate of the Holy See, possessed the right of confirming the episcopal elections, and there was no archbishop in the land.

The Conqueror would not allow Stigand to crown him, and that resulted in another wrong done to the rights of the See of Canterbury, for Eldred, the northern primate, crowned the king, and that, too, in the province of Canterbury, where he had no jurisdiction. Then, on Low Sunday, April 11, 1070, within two years of the Conquest, the king got rid of Stigand; for on that day two cardinal priests, legates of Alexander II., deprived him of his dignity—he had been already suspended by the Pope—and William put him at once in prison, out of which he never came forth alive.

Stigand deserved his miserable lot, but it is not so certain that the others—bishops and abbots, who were deprived of their churches—were guilty, all of them, of the offences laid to their charge. St. Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester, was assailed, but he maintained his right, and was not afraid of the face of the king. At a later time the Conqueror and Lanfranc also made an attempt to depose him, but failed, and St. Wulstan was Bishop of Worcester when the Conqueror and Lanfranc were in their graves.

The prelates of foreign origin were not disturbed, and these kept their places; but the native prelates had to yield possession to the men who came over with the Conqueror. While the laymen demanded as their share of the booty, counties, manors,

and castles, the ecclesiastics, secular and regular, must have abbeys and bishoprics. Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, half-brother of the king, had the county of Kent, of which he was made earl, and immediately plundered the See of Canterbury; Walcheline, the royal chaplain, was made Bishop of Winchester; Remigius, a monk of Fécamp, Bishop of Lincoln, and he is said to have made a bargain with the king which was thus satisfied; Thomas, canon and treasurer of Bayeux, had the See of York, opportunely vacant by the death of Aldred, the last of the native-born prelates of that See, for many years. On the Feast of the Assumption, A.D. 1070, Lanfranc, Abbot of Caen, accepted and took possession of the See of Canterbury. He was consecrated on the Feast of St. John Baptist following, by William the Norman, Bishop of London, who had been expelled with Robert, the Norman archbishop, and whose See had been administered illegally by Stigand, but who recovered it in the train of the Conqueror, and was a great benefactor to his Church. The new Archbishop of York now applied for consecration, which had been delayed for some reason or other. Perhaps it was because he wished to be independent of Canterbury; if so, he must wait till there was an archbishop in Canterbury to maintain the rights which he denied to exist. He would make no profession of obedience to the See of Canterbury, and Lanfranc refused to consecrate him. The dispute was carried, not before the Pope, but before William the Conqueror, and he, taking the Pope's office into his own hands, gave sentence for Lanfranc. Thomas of Bayeux submitted, and the southern primate, though he had not received the pallium, consecrated his defeated rival, and thereupon both went to Rome to petition the Sovereign Pontiff each for his own pallium.

Lanfranc had sent to Rome before for the pallium, but his messengers could not be attended to; he must appear in person, and make the petition in the usual way. He was not unknown in Rome, and it is very probable that the Pope thought it not safe to make any concessions to a prelate who was self-willed beyond ordinary men. With them Remigius, the Bishop of Lincoln, also went, for his simony had become known, and there was no remedy but at the Holy See for his offence. The Pope deprived him, and at the same time deprived Thomas of the See of York, notwithstanding the favour of the king and of Lanfranc. Thomas was incapable of a bishopric, because his father was a priest. The Pope gave Lanfranc authority to determine all matters concerning the two prelates, and that authority was exercised in their favour; Lanfranc interceded for them, and they were restored to their respective Sees. Though Thomas of Bayeux owed Lanfranc much for his help before the Pope, yet the Archbishop of York would not sacrifice the rights of his See. The canons of York had

persuaded him into the belief that he ought to acknowledge no superior in Lanfranc; so upon his restoration to his See he instituted a suit against the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the cause was pleaded before the Pope. Alexander II. declined to hear it out, and said that it was much better to litigate in England, where the witnesses could be more easily produced, and the matter determined by the testimony and judgment of the bishops and abbots of the whole realm.*

The two archbishops came home, and at Easter 1071 presented themselves before the king; that was the way they respected the Papal mandate. They pleaded their cause before the Royal Court, and the Royal Court decided the question, and gave sentence in favour of the See of Canterbury and against the See of York.†

Thomas of York had other grievances, which on this occasion he complained of. The dignity of his See was unjustly lessened by the encroachments of Canterbury. He claimed as suffragan Sees that of Dorchester (afterwards known as Lincoln), that of Worcester, and that of Lichfield. The dispute about these bishoprics was also referred by the Pope to the judgment of the bishops and abbots, but it was determined in a civil court, and these bishoprics were found to be suffragans of Canterbury, and to owe no subjection to the See of York. Lanfranc having gained the cause, gave to Thomas, according to Gervase of Canterbury, the See of Durham for the sake of peace, and that having one suffragan, the See of York might be ruled by an archbishop.‡

The Conqueror gave him the suffragan in the person of Walcher, a native of Lorraine, and from the diocese of Liège, his predecessor Egelwine being in prison at Abingdon, if he was not dead. But it was an unhappy choice on the part of the king. The officials of the bishop oppressed the people, and that oppression became an excuse for rebellion. The bishop went to Gateshead to meet the discontented, and made every effort to pacify them, but they demanded more than the bishop would grant. It is a very sad and bitter story. Liulf, a Saxon nobleman of great possessions in the land, took refuge with all his people under the shadow of St. Cuthbert, where he trusted he might be safe from

* Gul. Malmesb. Gest. PP. lib. i. § 25, Rolls ed.: "Decrevit Alexander Papa oportere hanc causam in Anglica terra audiri, et illic totius regni episcoporum et abbatum testimonio et iudicio diffiniri."

† *Ibid.*: "Uterque igitur in Paschali solemnitate ad regem venit, ibique prolati in medium partium rationibus, sententiam de negotio regalis curia dedit."

‡ "Actus PP. de Lanfranco. Attamen pro bono pacis Lanfrancus sponte concessit Thomæ, ut Dunelmensis episcopus de cetero sibi profiteretur et ut suffraganeus obediret, ut vel sic uno saltem decoratus episcopo nomen archiepiscopi obtineret."

the violence and injustice of the greedy Normans. The bishop became his friend, and he became a friend of the bishop, who took his advice in the great questions that might from time to time arise in the secular administration of the county; for the bishop was also a secular prince, and the king had no jurisdiction in Durham.

Leobwin and Gilbert, two of the bishop's officials, the latter his kinsman, leagued together for the ruin of Liulf, of whom Leobwin especially was jealous, and in the end murdered him. For this murder there arose a cry for justice, and the country was greatly disturbed. The bishop met the people at Gateshead, and there in a small church endeavoured to pacify them without punishing the murderers. The crowd threatened the bishop himself, and to save him, Gilbert his kinsman, who was really the instrument of Leobwin, went out of the church and gave himself up to the mob. He was instantly killed. Leobwin remained within, afraid to stir, knowing perhaps that the people would not dare to lay hands on him in the church. The bishop went out, and though he begged the multitude to spare him, yet was he slain at the very door of the church. Still, the chaplain, who was the source of the calamity, would not stir; so the mob set the church on fire. The unhappy man, half burnt, came out at last; he could bear the fire no longer, and fell beneath the fury of the mob, who received him at the door of the church upon the point of their swords, having already slain a hundred of the bishop's retainers.*

A deed of this kind could not be left unpunished, and as soon as it was known, the Chief Justice, who was no other than the Bishop of Bayeux, Earl of Kent, marched into Durham with a large force of men-at-arms, and laid waste the greater part of the bishopric. He was without mercy in his dealings with the wretched inhabitants. The innocent who had no share in the murder remained at home, fearing no evil, but they were not spared; the bishop ordered some of them to be put to death or disabled, and put others to ransom. He was not satisfied with this; he must also plunder the cathedral. He took away with him a pastoral staff of marvellous workmanship, and there is no record of restitution.

Another disastrous promotion was that of the Norman Abbot of Abingdon, who enriched his kindred with the manors of the monks. It was still worse at Glastonbury, which had been given to Turstin, a monk from Caen, probably through the influence of Lanfranc, or perhaps on the recommendation of Odo, by whose

* Roger of Wendover—ad an. 1080—has preserved the words of the leader of the mob: "Schort rede, good rede, slea ye the bischop."

liberality he had been educated. He was sent for from Lanfranc's abbey, and made the ruler of the community, which prided itself on its uninterrupted descent from St. Joseph of Arimathea. There the monks sang the office according to the Roman rite, and the Gregorian chant * was held in honour. This was not pleasing to the ears of the new abbot, who, despising the Roman song, insisted on the adoption in the monastery of the chant of a certain William of Fécamp. The monks had grown old in their own uses and customs, and refused to obey the abbot in a matter which was to them a pure revolution, and the breaking up of the immemorial usage and good traditions of the house.

Then, at last, the abbot, seeing that they were resolved to disobey him, entered the chapter-house one morning when the monks had no expectation of seeing him. He was attended by his men-at-arms, the retainers of the abbey. The monks fled in terror into the church, and took refuge at the high altar. But they were not in safety at the foot of the crucifix, for the soldiers of the abbot pursued them into the sanctuary. Two monks were slain at the altar, and then the others, seeing that their lives were in danger, seized the benches and the candlesticks, and attacked the soldiers, and finally drove them out of the choir. Some of the soldiers were hurt, but the monks lost two, and had fourteen grievously wounded. This method of enforcing discipline in a monastery was more vigorous than the Conqueror liked, so he sent the abbot back into Normandy, whence he had come; but as the conduct of the monks themselves was not regular, very many of them were sent away into other houses, there to be kept as prisoners. Turstin remained in Normandy while the Conqueror lived, but on the accession of William the Red he saw his way back. He gave the new king five hundred pounds, and became Abbot of Glastonbury. The unhappy man led a dissipated life, wasted the goods of the abbey, and ended his days in misery.

Arfastus was one of the royal chaplains, and was made Bishop of East Anglia, or Elmham. That See was in 1075 the See of Thetford, and in 1094, and afterwards, the See of Norwich. Arfastus was not satisfied with his cathedral church, and at once attempted to seize on the monastery of St. Edmund in Bury. The monks complained of his conduct, and with good reason, to Alexander II., who ordered the bishop to abstain from evil-

* Florent. Wigorn. ii. p. 16, ed. Hist. Soc.: "*Hic inter cætera stultitiæ suæ opera Gregorianum cantum aspernatus monachos cæpit compellere, ut, illo relicto, cujusdam Willelmi Fescamnensis cantum discerent et cantarent. Quod dum ægre acciperent, quippe qui jam tam in hoc quam in cætero ecclesiastico officio secundum morem Romanæ ecclesiæ insenuerant.*"

doing. Lanfranc also was directed by St. Gregory VII. to see that his suffragan respected the Bull of his predecessor; but there is no evidence of Lanfranc's obedience. On the contrary, the archbishop deprived the Abbot of Bury of his Bull; nor did he restore it very readily, for he kept it till he was near his end. Thus the archbishop, instead of obeying the Pope, helped the bishop to molest the abbey, because, by the act of Lanfranc, they could not produce the proofs of their exemption from the episcopal jurisdiction.*

Lanfranc was not an idle bishop, nor indifferent to his state. He was munificent in all his ways; but he could bear no superior other than the king. To the Conqueror he always deferred, and by so doing obtained whatever he wished. When Walcheline, the Bishop of Winchester, resolved to drive the monks out of the cathedral, and put into their places forty secular canons, he did so with the assent, first had, of the king, and said nothing apparently to his Metropolitan of the innovation he had devised. Lanfranc heard of this with dismay, and Walcheline was compelled to restore the monks to their church. On this occasion Lanfranc did more; he complained to the Pope, and his Holiness sent his letters into England forbidding the bishops to disturb the monks in the cathedral churches. Certain powerful persons had laid their plans for expelling the monks from the cathedral of Canterbury, hoping thereby to make havoc of the other cathedrals with greater ease.† They were foiled by the archbishop, who, a monk himself, would not consent to the ruin of his brethren.

The bishops made by the Conqueror were first his chaplains, generally, and necessarily secular priests, for the monks were restrained to their monasteries, and could not serve the king either as chaplains or as his servants in civil functions. These made bishops saw with an evil eye the cathedral church in the possession of monks, and they have been charged with rather mean purposes in their warfare against the monks. They desired to reward their own chaplains, if not their kindred, with honourable positions in the cathedral. That was not possible, there being neither deans nor canons in their churches. If this be true of them, it cannot be denied that they had abundant reasons, for out of the fifteen English chapters then existing six

* Eadmer. Hist. Nov. lib. iii. : "Ante paucos siquidem annos Balduinus ipsius cœnobii Abbas Romam adierat, et apud Alexandrum Papam privilegium ipsi abbatiæ adquisierat, per quod eam a subjectione omnium episcoporum, salva Primatis obedientia, liberam effecerat. Quod factum Lanfrancus archiepiscopus moleste accipiens ipsum privilegium Abbati abstulit, nec illud ei nisi circa finem vitæ suæ multorum precibus motus reddere voluit."

† Eadmer. pp. 18, 19.

only consisted of secular priests. The Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry had two chapters: that in Lichfield was formed of secular priests; that of Coventry, of Benedictines, as were all the other regular chapters. The See of Carlisle, founded at a later time, had its chapter of canons regular—Augustinians, and was the only one of that kind in England. But the history of Lichfield and Coventry is somewhat strange. The former was made a Metropolitan See, governed by an archbishop, who had more suffragans under him than the dispossessed Jainbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, who retained only London, Winchester, Sherborne, and Selsey. This state of things, created by Pope Hadrian I., lasted but a short time, and the See of St. Augustine recovered its ancient authority. Coventry in A.D. 1188 had Hugh de Nonant as its bishop, a man of some consideration and of few scruples. Baldwin, the archbishop, was forced to excommunicate him because he took the office of sheriff upon him. He could not endure the monks at Coventry. He accused them of seeking his life, and then drove them out, employing soldiers for the purpose—as lately in France—and in their place he put those whom in the day of his repentance he called *irreligiosos clericos*. The monks had nowhere to go to, and were beggars; but some of them went to Rome, and appealed to the Pope for redress. The suit dragged on for seven years, and one monk alone was in Rome when Innocent III. ascended the Papal throne. This monk, Thomas by name, having heard of the death of the bishop, went at once with his petition to the Pope, who, having read it, asked the monk if that was not the petition which had been rejected by his predecessors Clement and Celestine. The monk admitted the fact, and the Pope said: "Why do you think you can get from me what you could not get from them? Go: you are waiting here for no good." "Holy Father," replied Thomas, bursting into tears, "my petition is just and right; I have waited for the death of your predecessors; I shall now wait for yours, and I shall gain my end from your successor." The Pope was astonished at the language of the poor monk, and said to the cardinals around him, "You have heard what that devil has said;" then turning to the monk, said: "Brother, per sanctum Petrum, you shall not wait here for my death; your petition has been granted;" and then, without any delay, he sent orders to Hubert, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to restore the church of Coventry to the monks at once, which was done, and they were in possession of their ancient home before the new bishop of Coventry was elected.

Hugh de Nonant's death was edifying and very touching; he repented of all the enormities of his life, and also of the expulsion of the monks. On his deathbed—he being then in Nor-

mandy on his way to Rome—he sent for all the abbots and priors to come to his help, and among them was the Abbot of Bec. He made his confession, apparently aloud, with great contrition and abundant tears, so that all the religious present were unable to refrain from tears themselves; and when he asked them to assign him his penance, they kept silence, not knowing what to say, for the bishop's sins were grievous and his contrition deep. At last, receiving no answer, he said that he knew they were hesitating because of his sins, and begged them to give him for his penance to remain in purgatory till the day of judgment. The priests present assented, *salva semper sibi clementia divina*. Thereupon the bishop begged the abbot of his great charity to give him the habit, that in the next world he might have for his protectors those whom he had persecuted in this.*

Again, in the reign of Stephen the See of Canterbury very nearly lost some of its suffragans. Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester and legate of the Holy See, obtained the consent of Lucius II. to his becoming Archbishop of Winchester with a suffragan in the then Abbey of Hyde, which was to be made the cathedral church of a new diocese. Chichester, also, and perhaps other bishoprics, were to be taken out of the province of Canterbury; but the times were full of troubles, and the bishopric of Winchester remained as it had always been.

The See of Canterbury lost none of its rights under Lanfranc; the northern priests maintained that Lanfranc robbed them of theirs for his own advantage. He certainly obtained authority in the northern province, and a superiority over his brother primate. The Archbishop of York was an unwilling subject, and missed no opportunity for rebellion, as the southern ecclesiastics would call his acts. It was considered a hardship to attend synods in the south at the bidding of Canterbury, who had also the right to hold his synods even in the province of York. This being so, it became necessary to make provision for the precedence of the bishops, and that was done after this order: the Archbishop of Canterbury was the president, having on his right hand his brother of York, and on his left the Bishop of London, who was considered to be the dean of the province. The Bishop of Winchester was to be next to the Archbishop of York. But if the Archbishop of York was absent, the Bishop of London sat in his place, and the Bishop of Winchester then sat on the left hand of the Archbishop of Canterbury,† and next to him.

But if the synod met, and the Archbishop of Canterbury was absent, then the Archbishop of York presided, having on his

* Roger de Wendover, ad an. 1198.

† Wilkins, Conc. i. 363, ad an. 1075.

right the Bishop of London, and on his left the Bishop of Winchester. There was no provision made for the other bishops, except that which is the ecclesiastical rule and custom; they were to sit in the order of their consecration.*

This question of the precedence of bishops has been raised in many countries and at many times. It has been proposed that they should rank among themselves according to the dignity or age of their respective Sees, but that could not be a rule of the slightest service, for the dignity and antiquity of Sees are in dispute: that was to build upon sand. Another suggestion is, that bishops who are doctors shall have precedence of those bishops who are not doctors; that is perhaps a worse rule than the other, for it would have for its immediate result the distinguishing of bishops among themselves as learned and unlearned.

This order, established by Lanfranc, was the order of precedence in England for four centuries and a half; all bishops and abbots and priors having in Parliament, and no doubt elsewhere, as members of the ecclesiastical order, their due precedence over all laymen of whatever rank or dignity. The change was made in A.D. 1531, by an Act of Parliament, 31 Henry VIII. c. 10, when the bishops, having renounced the Pope, had accepted the royal supremacy. They had further delivered up their Bulls to the king, and bowed before Cromwell as his vicar-general. This vicar-general, by the Act of Parliament, had precedence of all the bishops and of all the peers; then came the Archbishop of Canterbury, next to him the Lord Chancellor; the Archbishop of York followed, now reduced to the fourth place. The Bishop of London was brought down to a place below the great officers of State and all the peers except the barons, and had to give way to these if they held any office of importance in the State. The Bishop of Winchester was made to give way to a prelate of the northern province, and to sit below the Bishop of Durham. The other bishops kept their places above the barons, and were allowed to sit according to the ecclesiastical rule, whereby a bishop, whether with a See or without a See, takes his place among his brethren in the order of consecration. The prelates were now by their own act the serfs of the Crown, and treated with contempt. If they had kept the faith, they would not have been placed under the jurisdiction of Thomas Cromwell.

Lanfranc having saved the rights of his See from diminution in his contest with the northern prelate, had to rescue many of its manors out of the devouring jaws of another bishop, who ought to have been more honest. Odo, half-brother of the Conqueror, was Bishop of Bayeux, and had landed in Sussex with

* Malmesbur. Gest. Regg. lib. iii. § 300, ed. Hardy.

the invading host. He is said to have clad himself in armour, and to have been in the fatal battle of Hastings, but without drawing his sword. For his reward he was made Earl of Kent, and for the maintenance of his dignity had in that county 184 lordships, and more than 250 in other counties.* He was not satisfied with his share of the plunder, and finding the old chauntry of the Saxons without a protector—for Stigand was worse than useless—he seized upon many of the manors of Canterbury, and made them, so far as he could, the property of the Earl of Kent. It is true that he was also Bishop of Bayeux, but he was not moved by any respect for that dignity; he must aggrandize himself as a secular baron, though at the expense of possessions which he knew were sacred.

Lanfranc complained to the king of those evil deeds of his brother, and was permitted to institute a lawsuit—that seems to be all the king could do for him—for the recovery of the stolen manors. The court was held on Penenden Heath, and with the consent of all, Lanfranc obtained possession of his own.

Agelric, the deposed Bishop of Selsey, whom the king kept imprisoned in Marlborough, was brought to the court, for he was known to be very learned in the laws of the land, but it was in a carriage, and the reason why that fact is recorded of him alone may be that he was either a very old man, or worn out by the severity of his imprisonment. Though the king and Lanfranc were glad to have the service of his learning, they were not generous enough to give him his freedom. The Pope had remonstrated with Lanfranc for his neglect of the bishop, and required him to replace him in his See of Selsey, or try him again if it was thought well to do so. The Pope was not satisfied with the first trial, and pressed both Lanfranc and the king to observe the rules of justice, and give the bishop an opportunity to defend himself. But the king and the archbishop gave no heed to the instructions of the Pope, and Agelric died in jail, and no evil is known of him.

Lanfranc was not careful only of the rights and privileges of his See; he brought order out of the confusion with which the ecclesiastical discipline had fallen in Canterbury. That church had been for seventeen years without a bishop, for Stigand was a usurper, and his authority was not recognized throughout the province, nor could it be. The monks, moreover, were not likely to accept for their archbishop and abbot a secular priest, contrary to the unbroken custom of their Church. The result was great disorder in the monastery,† and manners inconsistent with the rule of St. Benedict.

* Foss. *Biographia Juridica*: Odo.

† Malmesbur. *Gesta PP.* p. 70, Rolls ed.: "*Monachi Cantuarensis sicut*

On the whole, it must be admitted that Lanfranc was much more careful of his own rights than of the rights of others, if we except the rights of the Crown, or rather the encroachments of the Crown on the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Archbishop of Canterbury was then regarded throughout the land as more than the equal of the king. He was the parish priest of the king in every part of his English dominions; he alone could crown him. He had many manors in the land, and over those manors no bishop had jurisdiction; the ecclesiastical jurisdiction belonged to the archbishop, and then, as natural legate of the Holy See, he exercised great powers, so that it was sometimes difficult to ascertain whether the acts were those of the metropolitan or of the legate. Notwithstanding all this, Lanfranc sacrificed to the king the immunities of clerks in holy orders.

Odo, half-brother of the Conqueror, was not perfect in his life. As Earl of Kent he allowed himself many liberties unbecoming his sacred character; but he was a bishop, and therefore, like all ecclesiastics, exempt from the secular jurisdiction. The Conqueror himself, though disapproving of his brother's habits, acknowledged his rights in the immunities of his state. Having made him powerful; he could not control him; so he complained to Lanfranc, lamenting the straits he was in. The archbishop replied, "Put him in jail." Even William the Conqueror was startled at this counsel, and said, "What! The man is in Orders." Lanfranc, nothing daunted, answered, "You will lay hands, not on the Bishop of Bayeux, but on the Earl of Kent."* The king took the advice of the archbishop, and resolved to arrest his brother; but he could find no one among his servants who would commit the sacrilege, and he was obliged himself to lay hands on the Earl of Kent, who was all the time the Bishop of Bayeux, clerk in holy orders.† The unhappy bishop remained in prison for the rest of his brother's days; the remonstrances of the Pope were disregarded; and this great scandal was the work of Lanfranc, who sacrificed the immunities of the Church to please one of the most

omnes tunc temporis in Anglia sæcularibus haud absimiles erant, nisi quod pudicitiam non facile proderent. Canum cursibus avocari; avium prædam raptu aliarum volucrum per inane sequi; spumantis equi tergum premere, tesseras quaterere, potibus indulgere, delicatiori victu et accuratiori cultu; frugalitatem nescire, parsimoniam abnuere, et cætera id genus, ut magis illos consules quam monachos pro frequentia famulantium diceres."

* Malmesbur. Gest. Rgg. lib. iv. § 306, ed. Hardy. "Non episcopum Baiocarum capies, sed comitem Kantie custodies."

† Order. Vital. lib. vii. c. 8: "Cumque nullus in episcopum auderet injicere manum, rex ipse primus apprehendit eum. Illo autem reclamante 'Clericus sum et minister Domini, non licet pontificem damnare sine judicio Papæ.' Providus rex ait 'ego non clericum nec antistitem damno sed comitem meum.'"

savage of men. The evil done bore fruit, and St. Anselm and St. Thomas had to gather it, in the reproaches made to them, that they did not conduct themselves, in their relations with Henry I. and Henry II., as Lanfranc had done with their father and great-grandfather.

Again, in the dispute between the Bishop of Durham and William the Red, Lanfranc was on the side of the king. That bishop certainly deserves no great consideration, for, though he insisted on the observance of law in his own affairs, he laid aside on a later day all respect for justice in the persecution of St. Anselm, and was one of the most persevering enemies of the saint in his utmost need. William of St. Calais, Bishop of Durham, was suspected by the king of having been in a conspiracy against him. The bishop denied the charge, and offered to prove his innocence in the usual way, and as it became a bishop. The king required him to plead as if he were a layman : that the bishop neither could nor would do. Besides, as Bishop of Durham he was possessed of the civil jurisdiction within the bishopric, and the king had none there. However, the king seized the bishopric, put his own officers in the place of those of the bishop, and even laid waste the land. After much labour and contention, it was settled that the bishop should go to the king, but his person was to be safe from insult and wrong. He went therefore to Salisbury, where the king held his court ; Lanfranc and many bishops, with the secular barons, sitting to hear the cause. Now, William the Red had taken away everything from the bishop except the castle of Durham, and there the prelate took refuge, and defended himself as well as he could with the help of his own soldiers. The estates of the Church had been wasted, and even given away to the king's friends, so that the bishop was not only harassed, but robbed of nearly all that he had, without even the shadow of a legal trial. There was therefore no reason why he should appear as defendant in any court, seeing that the king had taken the law into his own hands, and not only had condemned the bishop in his absence without trial, but had also executed with the utmost severity the sentence which he thought the bishop deserved. The prince-palatine of Durham was not a plaintiff, and the king being the wrongdoer, brought his action against the wronged. In Salisbury none of the bishops would even speak to their brother of Durham ; his metropolitan, also Thomas of York, refused him any recognition. That was the king's will and commandment. In the court the bishop stood alone, and demanded, before pleading, the restitution of his property ; that was his right. Thereupon, Lanfranc replied—the king keeping silence—that neither the king himself, nor any one on his behalf, had robbed the bishop, and that the bishop had never seen the king's writ by which he

was dispossessed. No doubt that was so, and the injustice was therefore the greater; but Lanfranc was not ashamed thus to defend iniquity in the king and to oppress a bishop.

The bishop, however, persisted in his demand of restitution before pleading, and there could be no answer to his claim. Lanfranc indirectly admitted that the demand was legal and just; for he asked the bishop to plead, and then make his claim against the king. The bishop upon this asked Lanfranc if the words he had just used were words of kindly counsel or the sentence of the court. Lanfranc seems to have been irritated by the observation of the bishop, and replied that he had not spoken the words as giving sentence; but that the king, if he would trust him (Lanfranc), would very soon make them so. Thereupon the barons present, encouraged by the manifest partiality of Lanfranc, made a great clamour in the court, and insisted on the bishop's pleading.

When the tumult had ceased and silence obtained, the bishop addressed himself to the barons, and said that he had nothing to say to them; they were not his judges, and he would not be judged by them. If it was the pleasure of the king and the bishops to allow of their presence there, it was indecent in them to interrupt him as they had done. The king then said he was surprised at the conduct of the bishop refusing to answer the charge he had brought against him. Roger Bigot then asked the king to let the bishop know the charge, and give judgment upon the answer of the prelate; to this the bishop replied that he would have law observed, and would make no answer whatever before he obtained restitution of his own lands, or legal authority produced to the effect that he was bound to answer anything in the state he was in—namely, despoiled of the bishopric.

Geoffrey de Moubrai, Bishop of Coutances,* who had come over with the Conqueror, and had received as his share of the booty two hundred and eighty manors, suggested that the court should retire, and decide whether the bishop should or should not plead under these conditions. Lanfranc said, No; let the bishop withdraw. The bishop replied that he would willingly go out of the court, but he warned the bishops to keep in mind that he too was a bishop. "Go out," said Lanfranc; "we shall act justly."

It seems that Lanfranc saw no injustice in sending the bishop out of the court, and allowing the king, who was plaintiff, to remain, and to take part in the consultation of the judges, with all his officers who were there. There was considerable delay

* Order. Vital. lib. viii. c. 23: "Præfatus enim præsul nobilitate lucebat, magisque peritia militari quam clericali vigeat, ideoque loricatorum milites ad bellandum quam revestitos clericos ad psallendum magis erudire noverat."

before the doors of the court were opened ; at last the bishop was called in, and told by the Archbishop of York, Lanfranc assenting, that he must answer and put in his plea before his fief would be restored to him. "Fief!" said the bishop, "there has been no mention of fief either by me or by any one else; I demand the restitution of my bishopric." Lanfranc replied that it was well known he held a fief, and that judgment was given. The bishop then said, as he said before this sentence was delivered, that he appealed to the Pope. "Withdraw," said Lanfranc; "and the king, after consultation had, will let you know his resolution." The bishop withdrew. Then, on re-entering the court, Hugh de Beaumont rose and said that the judgment of the court was against him, and that his fief was forfeited because he had appealed to the Pope. The bishop answered that he would make good his cause before the Pope. "I and my fellows," said Hugh, "re-affirm our sentence in this court." The bishop was resolute, and replied that he would enter no plea in that court, where all justice was trampled under foot, and sentence given against him, after he had appealed to the Holy See.

The king now believing that he had succeeded, ordered the bishop to surrender the castle of Durham, but the bishop refused, because the final sentence of the highest court had not been given, to which he had appealed. Thereupon the red king swore, by the Holy Face, that the bishop should not escape out of his hands unless he surrendered the castle. The bishop replied to the royal threat: "I allowed three of your servants to seize my possessions, and to take away the treasure of the Church. I offered no resistance when that was done, though I had a hundred soldiers with me. I will make no resistance now; but I warn you, on the part of God and St. Peter, and his vicar our lord the Pope, against this further robbery." The king then implied that the bishop should never return to Durham, and the bishop said that he relied on the promise of the barons, by whom he had been persuaded to come to Salisbury. They had pledged their word for his safety, and they said so in court without any hesitation.

Lanfranc now interposed, and told the king that he might imprison the bishop if he refused to deliver up the castle; but the barons who had given their word for his safety protested against this breach of faith, while the archbishop maintained there was nothing of the kind, because the bishop refused to accept the sentence of the royal court. Then the bishop claimed the performance of the promise made to him—namely, a safe return to Durham. The archbishop insisted on his submitting to the judgment of the court, while he persisted in his appeal. Lanfranc said then: "Are you going to Rome, to the prejudice of the king and to bring

shame upon us all? Stop at home, and the king will restore to you the bishopric, with the exception of the city of Durham, if you will accept the judgment of his court." The bishop's answer was: "I have appealed to the Apostolic See, and nothing shall keep me from going thither; there is no justice to be had in the king's court." Lanfranc replied that he, and the others with him, would tell the king what to do with the bishopric if he went to Rome without the royal licence. But the bishop was not frightened; he persisted in his appeal, and for so doing was deprived by the king of his bishopric and of all he had. It was with great difficulty and the endurance of many hardships that he crossed over to Normandy, but it does not appear that he went to Rome or made any further attempts to prosecute his appeal.

Lanfranc, who was the Pope's legate, objected to this appeal, and moreover acknowledged that unchristian principle, which then perhaps he only acted on without confessing it, but which was afterwards recorded in writing in the Constitutions of Clarendon by Henry II.* He threatened the bishop with the loss of his bishopric if he went to Rome without the leave of the king. That was neither more nor less than a denial of justice, and the disowning of the authority of the Pope, seeing that the exercise of that authority in England was made to depend on the good pleasure of the king. It is true that the archbishop was himself at this time in a state of disobedience. He had gone to Rome for the pallium in person, because the Pope would not send it by a messenger, but he never repeated the visit, and he was one of the many bishops who remained in sullen silence while St. Gregory VII. was in trouble. The Pope had no help from Lanfranc.

St. Gregory VII. had often desired Lanfranc to visit the Holy See, as other bishops did, but all his mandates were neglected. Lanfranc made excuses, and never went to Rome. At last the patience of the Pope was worn out, and Lanfranc was ordered, in 1081, to present himself in Rome on or before the feast of All Saints, and make thereby some reparation for his disobedience, which the Pope had tolerated so long. If he did not appear on that day he was suspended from his office, and liable to be excommunicated.†

* Stubbs, "Select Charters," p. 138: "Archiepiscopis, episcopis et personis regni, non licet exire de regno absque licentia domini regis."

† St. Gregor. VII. Epp. lib. ix. ep. 20: "Apostolica tibi auctoritate præcipimus ut . . . in præsentis anni festo Omnium Sanctorum Romæ adesse procures et satagas, et inobedientiæ tuæ reatum per tantum temporis supportatum emendare non ulterius negligas. Quod si nec adhuc te mandata apostolica moverint . . . a Beati Petri gratia scias te procul dubio removendum . . . ita, videlicet, ut si infra prædictum spatium ad nos non veneris ab omni sis officio episcopali suspensus."

It is not recorded that Lanfranc gave the slightest heed to the mandate of the Pope. The archbishop had rarely done so, and the election of an Antipope three years later gave him an opportunity for considering the authority of St. Gregory VII. as a subject for discussion here. On the death of St. Gregory, in May 1085, he and the Conqueror withdrew from the communion of the Roman Church, and set up a schism, which lasted ten years. William the Conqueror had made a law that no one was to be acknowledged as Pope without the king's permission, nor any letters received from the Holy See before they were shown to the King.* In this way the King made himself the judge of the Papal elections, and further hindered effectually the exercise of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England; for, even if he had acknowledged the Pope, he had still the means to thwart him in his hands by refusing to receive his injunctions.

Thus, from the death of St. Gregory to the day when William Rufus consented to St. Anselm's reception of the pallium, the English nation was in schism, recognizing no Pope, and therefore out of the Catholic Church. Lanfranc and the Conqueror died in the schism they had made, and of the Conqueror it was said that he could find no one to hear his confession when on his bed of death. Victor III. was never recognized in England, nor Urban II. for six years of his reign.†

Until the Conquest this country was governed as a Christian country; the laws were made by Christians for Christians, and the decisions of the bishops were as much respected as the decisions of the sheriffs in their courts. In all the courts ecclesiastics sat by custom, if not by right; but this did not please the Conqueror, and so he shut the bishops and the archdeacons out of the existing courts, and compelled them thereby to hold their own courts alone for the future, promising, however, to enforce their sentences by his own officers, if necessary. But then he was judge of the necessity.

Then, having driven all ecclesiastics out of the secular courts, he made his own courts sovereign in spiritual matters. He made the law concerning the recognition of the Pope, already mentioned; he forbade the bishops to make any decrees in the provincial synods which he had not first seen and approved, and

* Eadmer. p. 10: "Non ergo pati volebat quemquam in omnidominatone sua constitutum Romanæ urbis Pontificem pro Apostolico, nisi se iubente recipere, aut ejus litteras, si primitus sibi ostensæ non fuissent ullo pacto suscipere."

† Eadmer. Hist. Nov. lib. i.: "Quæ res ut de aliis mundi partibus sileam, per plures annos ecclesiam Angliæ in tantum occupavit, ut, ex quo venerandæ memoriæ Gregorius qui antea vocabatur Hildebrandus, defunctus fuit, nulli loco Papæ usque ad hoc subdi vel obedire voluit."

he required a perfect exemption from all ecclesiastical censures for his men, no matter how heinous their sins.* Thus, none of the barons, none of his officers, were to be proceeded against in the ecclesiastical courts for adultery or any other deadly sin unless he allowed the bishop to exercise his rights. The King, by his laws, maxims, or customs or prerogative, put the whole ecclesiastical jurisdiction aside as completely as Henry VIII. at a later day. It is true that the Conqueror did not go so far as his descendant in his acts: that is the difference between them. William the Conqueror laid the egg and Henry VIII. hatched it; Lanfranc and his suffragans accepted the Reformation in principle, Warham and his suffragans drew the conclusion.

This claim of the King to a right to accept or reject the Pope was put forth by Rufus when St. Anselm proposed to go to Rome for the pallium, the Saint being asked from which of the Popes he meant to receive it, as if there could be more than one Pope, or that the rights of the anti-Pope were equal to those of the Vicar of our Lord. St. Anselm had already answered the question, for he had lived, when Abbot of Bec, as the subject of Urban II., and he was not going to renounce him in England. The King, having heard his answer, said that he himself had not acknowledged him; in other words, there was no Pope so far as the English people was concerned, and he added that he had a custom, and his father before him, which forbade any one without his leave to call any one Pope in England, and to rob him of this prerogative was equivalent to an attempt to deprive him of his crown.†

When William the Conqueror drove the bishop and the archdeacon out of the public courts, wherein they had probably sat from the beginning of Christianity in England, he began the battle between Church and State, breaking up the unity of the Christian commonwealth, and severing the bond of the civil duties of man with his supernatural obligations. His subjects found themselves immediately under two systems of legislation, founded on different principles. His promise to help the bishop in the administration of the ecclesiastical law was a confession that he was not bound to do so, seeing that he withdrew the

* Eadmer, p. 10.

† *Ibid.*, lib. i. p. 25, ed. Selden,—p. 52, ed. Rolls: "Anselmus. . . requisitus ergo a rege a quo Papa usum pallii petere voluisset, respondit, ab Urbano. Quo rex audito, dixit illum pro apostolico se nondum accepisse, nec suæ vel paternæ consuetudinis eatenus extitisse, ut præter suam licentiam aut electionem aliquis in regno Angliæ Papam nominaret, et quicunque sibi hujus dignitatis potestatem vellet præripere, unum foret ac si coronam suam sibi conaretur auferre."

great barons from the jurisdiction of the bishops, who were not allowed to censure them for their contempt of the commandments of God. The King's servants might sin with impunity, if it so pleased the King. The Conqueror also subjected all the estates of the bishops, abbots, and priors to burdens from which they had been hitherto free, but, for all that, he did not attempt to make ecclesiastical persons subject to his tribunals—the personal immunities were not violated by him, but by Lanfranc—and he also abstained from confiscating the revenues of vacant Sees and monasteries. Not so his successors. William II. kept bishoprics and abbeys vacant as long as he could, and had the revenues paid into the exchequer. But even he never ventured to touch ecclesiastical persons; he admitted, and so did his barons, that they were not to be summoned to the secular courts. This state of things came to an end under Henry I., who would have the bishops subject to himself, as the barons were. In this he was resisted by St. Anselm, and he never wholly succeeded in his enterprise, though the other bishops were ready to yield to him.

William II. walked in the ways of William I., and added to the sins of his father. His father never seized the estates of the prelates during vacancies, but the Red King, on the death of Lanfranc, not only seized on the possessions of the Church, but gave the manors away to his courtiers to be held by them, whether the archbishops cared to have them as tenants or not. Then when St. Anselm, seeing the disorders of the land, asked Rufus to let him hold a council for the correction of abuses, the King, relying on the maxims of the State, would allow no council to be held. When the Saint complained of the state of the monasteries, the King told him that was no affair of his. "The abbey, are they not mine?" When he told the King, who acknowledged no Pope, that he was a subject of Urban, the King's answer was there must be no Pope to England without his consent; that was his father's doctrine. When the Saint implored his suffragans to help him, their answer was that they went with the King; he might serve God if he liked, they had no such desire if it went against the King.*

William the Red considered it to be a prerogative of the Crown to determine who was Pope, and whether he should be acknowledged or not within his dominions; and, on learning from the bishops and the barons that there was neither court nor judge in England to try St. Anselm, he asked the bishops if they would renounce obedience to him. They said they would, and did so.

* Eadmer, lib. i. p. 56: "*Si autem secundum Deum quod ullatenus voluntati regis obviare possit consilium, a nobis expectas, frustra niteris, quia in hujusmodi nunquam tibi nos adminiculari videbis.*"

Having got thus far he thought the See of Canterbury fell into his hands, because St. Anselm, being out of the King's protection now, could not safely remain in England. But the archbishop, who was mildness itself, merely asked for protection to the nearest port, that he might leave the kingdom. Then, when Rufus saw that he was going away as archbishop, and not as a bishop dethroned, he saw again that he had lost his prey. Nevertheless, he preferred the archbishop's absence to his presence, and gave him a safe conduct. One of his chaplains, who was on the road himself to a bishopric, was to accompany the primate; and this unhappy man searched the baggage of the archbishop at Dover precisely as the baggage of Cardinal Campeggio was searched some four hundred years later at the same place, and for the same purpose. The Red King, like his father, trampled on the rights of all whom he thought he could master, and told the bishops that he would bear no equal in his kingdom, and so the Archbishop of Canterbury must go.*

Henry I. pursued the same plan. On the return of the archbishop after the death of Rufus and his own succession, he proposed that the archbishop should accept the See of Canterbury, which had never been resigned, from him as if he had never held it before; also he asked him to do homage as the barons did, and to observe his customs. St. Anselm refused to comply with these unreasonable demands, and the result was strife and contention. The archbishop was alone; none of the bishops gave him any help. Three of them were sent by the King to the Pope as his ambassadors, and their business was to obtain from the Holy See the sanction of the King's customs, among them being the investitures already condemned. The Pope would not listen to them; but they said publicly when they came back that the Pope allowed the King to invest the prelates as before, and that they had obtained this from his Holiness in a secret audience, to which the messengers of St. Anselm had not been admitted.

This was not true, and the Pope afterwards excommunicated the three bishops for having told a lie—so he expressed it—and forbade the investiture absolutely. The King still persisted, sent another agent to Rome, and even threatened the Pope, but to no purpose. One thing he gained, the archbishop left the country, partly to see the Pope and partly to avoid intercourse with the excommunicated prelates. The saint out of the kingdom received a message from the King, and remained in exile. But he never

* Eadmer, lib. i. 62: "*Dum vivo parem mihi in regno meo utique sustinere nolo.*"

ceased to fight for justice, and in the end the threat of excommunication prevailed and Henry allowed him to return. Even the bishops who had been unfriendly wrote letters to him imploring him to come back, for the tyranny and oppression had become more than they could bear.

King Stephen held the opinions of his predecessors; the bishops must be subject to him, not to the Pope. To ensure this he had the ports watched in order to hinder the bishops from going to the council which the Pope summoned and held at Rheims. The Archbishop Theobald made his escape, however, and was at the council. The ecclesiastical state did not suffer alone; under Stephen the whole country groaned, and the pathetic complaint of all was "that Christ and His saints were asleep." *

Henry II. carried on the war against the Pope, and had he succeeded would have left nothing for Henry VIII. to do. He tried to reduce his aggressions into accepted law with the consent of the prelates who were to be robbed. Like his modern imitators, he affected a zeal for good government, and under the pretence of checking abuses, alleged but not proved to exist, he proposed to extinguish for ever the jurisdiction of the Pope in England and to make himself the sovereign judge of ecclesiastical disputes over all persons and in all causes.

The patronage of churches is not a civil or temporal right, but a right created by the Pope; for, as the cure of souls universally is in him alone by the act of our Lord, so the presentation to benefices, collation, and institution necessarily belong to him by the same title, and if exercised by others it is by grant from the Pope, and in virtue of no right or authority belonging to any other. Henry II. by the constitutions of Clarendon required that all questions touching advowsons should be litigated and finally determined in his courts. This was depriving the Pope of his control over questions which never could rise if the Pope had not given to others by way of grace the advowson of benefices.

He then proposed to have it regarded as settled law that no bishop could leave the realm without his consent. If he had succeeded no archbishop could go to Rome for the pallium, no bishop could make the visit *ad limina* or attend councils even when summoned by the Pope.

As his great-grandfather had decreed, so he too would decree, that none of the great barons or ministers of the King should be excommunicated or their lands laid under interdict without the assent of the King. Then to secure himself in the possession of these exorbitant powers he set aside a fundamental principle of the ecclesiastical law, namely, that a suitor may carry his appeal from the lowest court, passing by the intermediate tribunals, to

* Saxon Chron. ad an. 1157.

the Pope directly of himself. Henry II. put the law and practice of the church on one side, and directed that the appeal from the court of the archdeacon should be made to that of the bishop, from the court of the bishop to that of the archbishop, and then to the court of the King; beyond that no one could go without the King's leave. Henry VIII. did no more.

These customs—so they were called—were resisted by St. Thomas of Canterbury, and there is no trace of any opposition to them on the part of the other bishops. On the contrary, they gave St. Thomas no help, and gave every help to the king, as they had to William the Red and Henry I., who had made them his slaves. They set the Pope at defiance, and, despising his prohibition, crowned Henry's son, thereby at the same time doing violence to the rights, which were never questioned, of the Mother-Church of Canterbury. William Rufus and Henry I. were resisted by none of the bishops, not even by Lanfranc, whose influence was so great. It was reserved for St. Anselm to fight for the jurisdiction of the Pope; all the bishops were against him and with the King, at whose request they renounced obedience to the Metropolitan. St. Thomas, again, in his turn, had to tread the winepress alone; none of the bishops were with him; and he has said it was never seen or heard of that any bishop in England, except an Archbishop of Canterbury, had ever risen up in defence of the Holy See in opposition to the King. As it had always been, he says, so it was in his day. The jurisdiction of the Pope was treated with contempt whenever it was the pleasure of the King to dispute it.* The bishops, for the most part, were either royal chaplains, or ministers of the King, in the temporal administration of the realm. That training was not good, for they were servants of the Crown rather than ministers of the Church, and the rewards of their civil services were too often high ecclesiastical positions. The chapters of the cathedral churches were coerced by the King, and were almost always compelled to appear before him, and make the seeming election of a bishop in the King's chapel, not in the cathedral church. The King in reality elected the bishop, the chapter accepting his choice, and was very rarely disappointed in the men he chose. William Rufus was disappointed, no doubt, in St. Anselm, and Henry II. in St. Thomas;† that was all.

* Epp. St. Thomæ, ep. 250, ed. Rolls,—37 ed. Giles: "Quem aliorum episcoporum in tota insula nostra vidistis aut legistis se pro tuenda libertate ecclesiæ pro conservandis institutionibus patrum, pro reverentia et obedientia Sedis Apostolicæ, præter Cantuarienses, se opposuisse principibus? et nostra quidem ætate, nec unus exstitit: et si veteres revolvantur historiæ, nullus occurret."

† Chron. Monast. de Bello, p. 142: "Putabat namque eum [Thomam] ex antiqua familiaritate in omnibus quæ vellet assensum præbiturum, nec sibi quavis occasione in aliquo contradicturum."

The bishops were with the King, even those whose lives were pure. There was no greater or more persistent enemy of St. Thomas than Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of London. When Alexander III. translated him, at Henry's request, from Hereford to London, because the King wanted him as his confessor, he charged him to moderate his austerities, which were very great, for the bishop chastised his body, ate no meat, and drank no wine.* Nevertheless, Gilbert Foliot, notwithstanding his ascetical life and unblemished conversation, cared nothing for the ecclesiastical laws, and was the too willing instrument of evil in the hands of the King. He was perhaps the more conspicuous abettor of wrong, but he was not alone, and we have the Pope's† word for it that all his brethren, with himself, were more observant of the royal commands than of the dignity of the priesthood.

Gilbert Foliot was a more dangerous enemy than even Roger of York; his reputation was greater, and he had more of the confidence of the King. He is said to have written the King's letter to the schismatical Archbishop of Cologne, declaring Henry's resolution to renounce the Pope, and to banish every one from the kingdom who should venture to obey him. Foliot wrote himself to the Pope in his own name and counselled patience, moderation, and concession; the Pope was not to break the bruised reed, nor to quench the smoking flax; he might expect everything from the King, provided he allowed him to have his will. The unhappy man, not content with his hypocritical pretence of respect for the Pope, had the insolence further to threaten him if he persisted in maintaining the rights of the persecuted Archbishop. He told the Pope that, though many had continued faithful to his Holiness in the troubles, yet one might be found who would accept the See of Canterbury from the King, with the pallium from the anti-Pope, and that every bishopric in England would be held by men who would be faithful to the new and schismatical Archbishop; many already looking forward to the commission of that iniquity.‡

Thus in the space of a hundred years after the Conquest the principles of the Conqueror had made themselves a home, from which they have never been dislodged in a land so abounding in saints; out of which kings went to Rome and laid their crowns at the feet of the Apostle, never to resume them. The King was

* Gilbert Epp. ep. 359, ed. Giles: "Audivimus autem et veridica multorum relatione comperimus quod tu carnem tuam, ultra quam deceat et expediât, attenuas et affligis, nec carnibus vescens, nec stomachum vino reficiens ad salutem."

† St. Thom. Epp. ep. 698 ed. Rolls—ep. 258, ed. Giles: "Dolemus admodum quod plus in episcopis Angliæ terreni principis reverentia quam Pontificalis honor valuit dignitatis."

‡ Gilbert Epp. ep. 174, ed. Giles: "Mandatum vestrum."

not ignorant, nor was he contending for mere ceremony; he understood his ends and prepared his means to attain them. When Lanfranc asked him to let him appoint the Abbot of St. Augustine's in Canterbury, as his predecessors had done, the King replied that he must have every pastoral staff at his own disposal; * that is, must appoint the bishops and the abbots, and thus stand between all the prelates and the Pope. Lanfranc is said to have made no answer, waiting, like all sensible people, for better times, which never come.

The English Church suffered from the Conquest, and never recovered her losses. The hand of the civil power became heavier and stronger with time, and there was no serious attempt at resistance made after the martyrdom of St. Thomas. Instead of rousing themselves from their slumbers, the prelates resigned themselves to further oppression; the immediate successor of St. Thomas abandoned the immunities which the martyr had won and the King had promised to respect.† This yielding up of immemorial rights proved fatal to the ecclesiastical spirit; acquiescence in the royal usurpations led to insubordination and resistance to the Pope. The dogged obstinacy of Baldwin was followed by the open rebellion of Cardinal Langton, whom the Pope was compelled to suspend, releasing all the prelates of the province from their obedience to the turbulent Metropolitan, who owed everything to the Pope.

The aim of the kings ‡ was to subject every person and every cause to their tribunals; in the words of St. Thomas, to "make the Pope unknown in England." This was one aim or end never lost sight of from the Conquest down to the day when the bishops, without exception, renounced the Pope, and made the Bride of Christ the handmaid of the civil power; and then that civil power turned her out of doors, dishonoured and disgraced.

The royal encroachments upon a jurisdiction which was not given to kings were defended by theologians; in the days of King John we had a theologian preaching in the interests of the Crown. Simon, the Cardinal's brother, encouraged the excommunicated barons in their rebellion, and caused Mass to be said before them by excommunicated priests. § No doubt this was a

* Gervas. Cant. vol. i. p. 71, ed. Rolls: "Respondit rex et dixit se velle omnes baculos pastorales Angliæ in manu sua tenere. Hæc est origo malorum. Lanfrancus ad hæc miratus est, sed propter majores ecclesiæ Christi utilitates, quas sine rege perficere non potuit ad tempus siluit."

† Trivet. Annal. ad an. 1176.

‡ S. Thom. Ep. 25, ed. Giles: "Ut . . . Romanus Pontifex nesciretur in Angliæ, et sponsæ Christi privilegia sine reparationis spe delerentur."

§ Roger de Wendov. ad an. 1217, vol. iv. pp. 32, 33.

time of confusion, and allowance may be made for disappointed men. Simon Langton had been elected by the canons of York some two years previously to the vacant See, and the Pope had not only quashed the election but declared Simon incapable of being a bishop without a dispensation from the Sovereign Pontiff.

But the language of the King before his submission, of the barons, of the citizens of London, of Simon Langton, and the Precentor of St. Paul, show how deep had become the ditch into which England had fallen. The Pope is told that England abounds in learned prelates, and is called a foreigner,* that is, the foreign prelate of later days; he is said to have no right to interfere with the affairs of laymen, that ecclesiastical affairs alone were within his competence; and then, having said this, they despise the sentence of excommunication, and proceed forthwith to the celebration of Mass.†

These, however, were, it may be said, the acts of angry men, who, when the fit of rage was over, would return to their duty, and repent. But that would not be a true account of the men; there was growing in the land a dislike of the Holy See, a jealousy of the Pope, perhaps even hatred of his powers, and consequently a desire to thwart them. Two Archbishops of Canterbury laboured hard to lessen the veneration for St. Thomas, and to divert the pilgrims from his tomb. It was after the severe lesson given him by the Pope, and his detention in Rome, that Cardinal Langton kept with such magnificence the first feast of the translation of the martyr; after his own acquiescence, and the acquiescence of the barons and the lawyers in the annulment of Magna Charta, which was the great monument of his rebellion.‡ It is true, indeed, that the barons compelled Henry III. to grant it anew, and in virtue of that grant it remains to this day in more or less honour.

The claim of the King to determine who was Pope, or whether there was a Pope at all, urged by the Conqueror and his son, William the Red, though not urged by any other king except

* Roger de Wendov. ad an. 1217, vol. iii. p. 216: "Cum archiepiscopi episcopi et alii ecclesiarum prælati . . . in omnium scientiarum plenitudine sufficienter abundent, si necessitas coegerit, extra terras suas justitiam vel judicium ab alienigenis non emendicabit." Thus King John in the thirteenth century spoke like Henry VIII. in the sixteenth.

† *Ibid.*, ad an. 1216, vol. iii. p. 337: "Ad interdicti sine excommunicationis sententiam nullum penitus habentes respectum, per totam civitatem celebrarunt divina, signa pulsantes et vocibus altisonis modulantes."

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 323: "Tunc Papa, habita deliberatione cum cardinalibus chartam sæpe dictam de libertatibus Angliæ concessis, in perpetuum per sententiam diffinitivam damnatam cassavit."

Henry IV., was not altogether harmless, though it was foolish. The King had chapels here and there, which were called free chapels or royal peculiars, and in which he pretended to have jurisdiction. This jurisdiction was wielded by the Chancellor, and as the Chancellor was an ecclesiastic, it is very probable that people did not inquire whence came that authority of the King's minister with which no bishop ventured to meddle.

The Abbot of Shrewsbury was compelled to answer the complaint of the canons of St. Mary's at the assizes. The canons went before the civil judges, not before the bishop or the metropolitan, and the result was that the court admitted their plea—namely, that neither our Lord the Pope nor any other ecclesiastical judge had any jurisdiction there. Thereupon the judges gave the King damages, and sent the abbot to prison. This was in Michaelmas term A.D. 1252, in the thirty-seventh year of Henry III.*

These free chapels were a trouble to those who considered the matter, and a very serious matter it is, for there was no explanation known of the source of the royal jurisdiction by which that of the Pope was ousted. So great was the difficulty, that some said that these free chapels were not ecclesiastical benefices at all; but that opinion, says Lyndwood,† could not be maintained. He discusses the matter with reference to the deanery of St. Martin-le-Grand, a church that once stood where now is the General Post Office, successor to a public-house built in the reign of Edward VI., over the space where was at one time the high altar of the church. Lyndwood says of this dean and others that he was never instituted or inducted by any episcopal authority, and that he was made dean by the King alone, irrespective of all ecclesiastical persons whatsoever. Nevertheless, the dean of St. Martin was a very important personage; he had many subjects; there was a baptistery in the church, and all the sacraments and sacramentals were administered there, either by himself or by his authority. He had jurisdiction independent of the bishop and the archbishop, and it would not have been safe for Lyndwood if he attempted in the court of Arches to say a word to the dean concerning any excesses he might have committed. He wielded all the jurisdiction of a

* "*Placitorum Abbreviatio*," col. ii. p. 128: "*Quod Dominus Papa nec aliquis alius iudex ecclesiasticus jurisdictionem aliquam in ea [libera capella] habeat.*"

† *De Cohabit. Cleric. cap. Ut clericali. voc Beneficiati*: "*Sed quid dicemus de Decanatu ecclesiæ St. Martini Magni Londoni et aliis quæ pertinent ad donationem regiam . . . sic quod talia occupantes non habeant institutionem ab episcopo nec inductionem ipsius auctoritate sed omnia expediuntur per ipsum regem.*"

bishop, and there is proof of it in the fact that Henry VI. authorized him to signify the names of excommunicated persons to the Chancellor.

Lyndwood, learned lawyer as he was, could not explain the matter; but he was confident that these free chapels were benefices, therefore under the jurisdiction of the Pope. Now, there was no pretence made that the jurisdiction in these churches had come to the King by grant of the Pope; nor was it said that the dean of St. Martin, for instance, had his jurisdiction by custom or prescription; nor is there any explanation whatever of it, except that of the royal supremacy which at a later time was extended to the whole realm by Henry VIII.

From royal chapels not subject to the Pope it was but a short distance to the prohibitions which the secular courts issued to the courts of the bishops. Then the legislation against bringing Papal bulls into the kingdom, commonly known as the laws of *Premunire*, which began with Edward I., and were perfected by Edward III. and Richard II., they were the mainstay of the Reformation, not repealed by Queen Mary, for the Chancellor, Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, loved them; they were largely used by Elizabeth, and culminated in the wonderful statute against Papal aggression.

These statutes were of service to the Government of the day, for they made the bishops afraid. Edward I., a few years before he made the law which is regarded as the foundation of the laws of *Premunire*, had of his own authority made a law which was always from his day most carefully observed. He compelled the bishops to renounce in writing every clause in the Papal Bulls against the rights of the Crown before he restored to them the estates of the bishopric; these too he kept, as the Kings before and after him, without law. The bishops were cowed; they dared not make any resistance, for if they did the King would seize their possessions, and perhaps drive them out of the country. But it must be confessed that before long they liked their bondage; the cucumbers and melons, the leeks, the onions, and the garlic of Egypt had become pleasant, for they found that they had more patronage at their disposal and a certain sense of security that the appeals to Rome would be fewer. When Martin pressed and pressed again the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was Chichele, to help him in getting rid of laws which, according to his words, placed the keys of St. Peter in the hands of the King, he could not prevail; the archbishop did nothing; he was with the King; and finally, when the Pope deprived him of his authority as natural legate of the Holy See, Chichele made a solemn protestation in the presence of a notary against the wrong done him, and appealed from the Pope to a general council.

These evils were rendered always greater by the interference of Parliament, which was at all times in a certain sense on the watch for an opportunity to oppress the Church. With the accession of the house of Lancaster there came in a new power, that of heresy; the house of Lancaster had protected Wicliffe, and many members of the House of Commons had adopted his opinions. For a long time nothing was done to check Wicliffe, but at last some one, it is not known who, gave information in Rome, and Gregory XI. sent several Bulls to England, to the bishops, to the King, and to the University of Oxford, where Wicliffe taught, and where the authorities for the most part were with him in his heresies. On the receipt of the Bulls the archbishop summoned Wicliffe before him, but the Duke of Lancaster defended him and baffled the bishops, who gave way, and Wicliffe died unmolested in the Rectory of Listerworth, but his doctrines survived him and are now dominant in the land where he was born and bred.

This constant warfare against the Pope could not but bear fruit. The bishops were among the greatest in the land, their position in the State of exceeding strength and dignity, but they were nevertheless constantly harassed and their jurisdiction obstructed in every possible way. They were treated outwardly with great reverence, but at the same time every one who could defied them. The farmers paid their tithes, but they left the sheaves of corn due to the priest in the field, and when the priest sent his servants for his portion of the crop, the farmers would not let them enter on the land and drove them away as trespassers. This was but a light matter compared with the theories of confiscation applied to the property of the Church and the ingenious methods of applying the theories. But the most astounding of all the iniquities that grew out of the tyranny of the State was the practice of arresting priests carrying the Most Holy to the sick and dying. This was done by the bailiffs of the civil courts in the reign of Edward III., the great opponent of the Papal jurisdiction. It is difficult to believe that wickedness so great could be seen in a Christian land, but the matter is beyond all doubt, for it is acknowledged by King and Parliament in the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II., and left on record for ever in a statute of the realm—namely, that “priests bearing the Sweet Body of our Lord Jesus Christ to sick people and their clerks with them . . . be sundry times taken and arrested by authority royal.”*

D. L.

* 50 Edward III. c. 5; and again 1 Rich. II. c. 15.

ART. VI.—WHERE ST. PATRICK WAS BORN.

1. *The Birthplace of St. Patrick.* By the BISHOP OF OSSORY. DUBLIN REVIEW, April, 1880.
2. *St. Martin and St. Patrick.* By the Rev. W. B. MORRIS. DUBLIN REVIEW, January, 1883.
3. *Where was St. Patrick Born?* By the Very Rev. SYLVESTER MALONE, M.R.I.A., &c. DUBLIN REVIEW, October, 1886.
4. *Documenta de S. Patricio, ex Libro Armachano.* Edidit R. P. ED. HOGAN, S.J. Bruxellis: 1882.
5. *Trias Thaumaturga.* Colgan, Lovanii: 1647.

ST. PATRICK was born near Dumbarton, at old Kilpatrick, on the Clyde.

The learned Bishop of Ossory, now Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney, wrote his Article in proof of the above statement of fact. "He does not fail," says the writer of the third Article, "to advance everything that can be said in its favour, with a clearness, fulness, and tact peculiarly his own." * He approached the question in a calm, judicial manner. First he produced his many authorities, and then deduced his conclusions from them with a straightforward force that should have brought conviction to any unbiassed mind. The second Article seems mainly written—though its title does not at all convey this—to prove that St. Patrick was born in France. It may be said at once that nothing new has been advanced to strengthen the arguments of Dr. Lanigan, which completely failed to establish that view. The writer of the third Article contends—not in joke, we assure the astonished, if not startled, reader; not in sarcasm, but in solemn earnest—that the Saint's hitherto unknown birthplace is Bath! A new authority has been found, not apparently seen by the other writers, on which he relies for the proof of his new and brilliant theory. The "Book of Armagh" contains the very ancient Life of St. Patrick written by Muirchu Maccumachtheni,† copied into it by Ferdomnach in A.D. 807. Unfortunately it is now defective. The commencement, which treats of St. Patrick's birth, is wanting. The Bollandists discovered a new Codex of this same biography, which completes the Life. This Codex has been edited by Fr. Hogan, S.J., and is the fourth work mentioned above.

In these circumstances it appears fitting, though scarcely

* DUBLIN REVIEW, 1866, p. 316.

† "Documenta," pp. 13, 14.

necessary, to say yet again a word for Scotland, and for the old Irish and Scotch belief regarding the birthplace of the great apostle of Erin. Without further preface, and as a proper foundation for our contention, we give, following the Bishop of Ossory's example, all the ancient authorities* as briefly as may be, and still without omitting anything that directly bears upon our subject. This is partly a repetition of what the Bishop wrote, yet a necessary one, in order that the reader may intelligently follow and fully understand what is to be advanced. The authorities are given without any intermingled comment. It will be thus the more easily seen how they agree, how they support, how they supplement, and how they complete one another, and prove indubitably, if their authority be admitted, where St. Patrick was born.

1. I, Patrick had for father Calpornius, a deacon, son of whilome Potitus, a priest: who was of the village of Benaven Taberniae, for he had close by a farm (Enon), where I was made captive.

Again, after a few years, I was in the Britains, with my kinsfolk, who received me as a son, and sincerely besought me, that now at any rate after such great tribulations, which I had endured, I should never again depart from them.

* We give some idea of the date of these authorities. The "Confessio" is admitted to be the genuine work of St. Patrick himself. The Bishop of Ossory, in his Article, considers the "Hymn of Fiacc" (Colgan's *Prima Vita*), with the glosses thereon in the "*Liber Hymnorum*," to date probably from the seventh century; the "*Vita Secunda*," citing Dr. Todd's authority, about 900; the "*Vita Quarta*," from intrinsic evidence, before 774; the "*Vita Quinta*" (that of Probus), of the ninth century; and the "*Tripartite*" to date from the tenth century, though many parts of it are much older. Mr. O'Curry, in his "*Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*," vol. ii. p. 75, calls the "*Liber Hymnorum*" "a manuscript more than a thousand years old, and which contains the oldest and most accurate copy of the poem (Fiacc's) now known to be extant." At page 90, he says: "a MS. . . . now eleven or twelve hundred years old." In his "*Lectures on MS. Materials of Ancient Irish History*," p. 345 *et seq.*, he argues at length on the very great antiquity of the "*Tripartite*," maintaining that the most ancient Lives are compiled from it. The Rev. J. F. Shearman, "*Loca Patriciana*," p. 196, says that Fiacc's Hymn "was fashioned into its present form before the end of the seventh century;" and p. 409, that the "*Quarta Vita*" "is supposed to have been compiled" about the end of the eighth century. W. F. Skene, "*Celtic Scotland*," vol. ii. p. 425, says that the oldest memoirs of St. Patrick are the Annotations of Tirechan; then, p. 430, dates the Life by Muirchu Maccumachtheni (of which the Brussels Codex is a copy), after which comes the Life by Fiacc, p. 435, belonging to the ninth century; then, p. 441, the second and fourth Lives in Colgan; and lastly come the Scholiast on Fiacc, Probus's Life, the third and Tripartite Lives. Marianus Scotus wrote in the eleventh century, and Jocelin of Furness in 1185.

. . . . And go into the Britains, although a journey I should be most desirous of taking, as to my fatherland and kinsfolk : and not thither only, but also even to the Gauls to visit my brethren, that I might see the face of the saints of my Lord.*

2. Patrick was born (conceived, it ought to be) in Nemthur. Succat his name son of Calpurn, son of Potitus, grandson of Deacon Odisse.†

3. Nemthur is a city in North Britain, viz., Ailcluade.

The cause of the servitude of Patrick was this : his father Calphurnius and his mother Conchessa and his five sisters and his brother Sannan, a deacon, they all went together from Strathclyde Britain on business across the Ictian Sea, south to Lethan Armorica, or Lethacensian Britain (Brittany), because certain of their kinsfolk were there. At that time the seven sons of Factmundius, King of the Britons plundered the Lethan Region of Armorica Britain. They killed Calphurnius there, and led Patrick and (his sister) Lupita captive with them to Ireland.‡

4. He, then, was born in that town, Nemthor by name. Patrick was born in the Campus Taburne. And it was called Campus tabernaculorum, because on a certain time in the winter season the Roman army pitched their tents in it, and thus it was called Campus Tabern—i.e., Campus Tabernaculorum.§

* 1. Ego Patricius patrem habui Calpornium Diaconem, filium quondam Potiti Presbyteri : qui fuit e vico Benaven Taberniae villam enim (Enon) prope habuit, ubi ego in capturam decidi. The "Confessio," cap. i. 1.

Iterum post paucos annos in Britanniis eram cum parentibus meis, qui me ut filium exceperunt, et ex fide rogaverunt me, ut vel modo post tantas tribulationes, quas ego pertuli, nunquam ab illis discederem. —The "Confessio," cap. iii. 10.

. . . . Et pergere in Britannias, etsi libentissime paratus irem, quasi ad patriam et parentes : et non id solum, sed etiam usque ad Gallias visitarem fratres meos, ut viderem faciem sanctorum Domini mei.—The "Confessio," cap. iv. 19. Villanueva, Dublini, 1835.

† 2. Genair Patraic i Nemthur. Succat a ainm.

Mac Calpuirn mic Otide, ho Deochain Odisse.—Colgan's "Trias Thaumaturga," Vita Prima.

‡ 3. Nemthur-i-cathir sein feil imbretnaib tuaiscirt-i-Ailcluade Nemthur est civitas in Septentrionali Britannia, nempe Alcluidea.—Colgan's Latin of the Scholium (rectius, of the North Britons ?).

Causa servitutis Patricii haec fuit : Pater ejus Calphurnius et Mater Conchessa et v. sorores ejus et frater ejus Diaconus Sannanus, omnes simul ex Britannia Alcludensi, trans mare Iccium, versus Austrum negotii causa contulerunt se ad Armoricam Lethanam, sive Britanniam Lethacensem, quia ibi erat quidam eorum cognatus. Eo autem tempore vii. filii Factmundii regis Britonum fecerunt praedas in Britanniae Armoricae Regione Letha. Et occiderunt ibi Calphurnium : et captivos secum in Hiberniam duxerunt Patricium et Lupitam.—"Trias Thaumaturga." Scholia Primae Vitae.

§ 4. Natus est igitur in illo oppido, Nemthor nomine Patricius natus est in Campo Taburne. Campus autem tabernaculorum ob hoc dictus, eo quod in eo Romani exercitus quodam tempore tabernacula sua

This was the cause of his first . . . coming to Ireland (Scotia was then the Latin for Ireland), an Irish army, a fleet as customary being collected, had frequently with a vast number of ships crossed over into Britain, and used to bring many captives thence. And following their usual practice this time, Patrick and his sister . . . were led captive to Ireland.

When I was a girl (his sister Lupita says to Patrick, they being captives in Ireland) in Britain, in my Fatherland Nemthor. . . .

5. Patrick, then, was born, &c., as in No. 4, as also is the second quotation.

Patrick, therefore, who was also called Suchet, was of the race of the Britons, and not far from the sea is his Fatherland, and the place where he was born: his father was Calburnius, son of Potitus, a venerable man, and his mother was called Conches.*

6. Some say that St. Patrick was of Jewish extraction. . . . But . . . his parents went into the district of Strathclyde. In this land Patrick was conceived and born, his father being Kalfurnius, his mother Conchessa, as he himself declares in the book of Epistles. . . . St. Patrick, then, was born in the town of Nemthor, which may be latinized "Heavenly Tower." This town is in the Campus Taburniae, which is called Campus Tabernaculorum, because on a time the Roman army pitched their tents in it. But in the British language it is Campus Tabern, and that is the same as Campus Tabernaculorum.

At that time Irish fleets were wont to sail across to Britain for plunder. . . . The venerable boy with his sister Lupita among others chanced to be led thither (to Ireland) captive.

When I was a girl (Lupita to Patrick) in my Fatherland, namely in Britain. . . .

And these things being done (in Ireland), with outspread sail and a prosperous breeze they reached the British bays. . . . And the Saint reaching (after 28 days in the desert) his parents, remained with them a few days. . . . Thence, as he had been admonished by the Angel, having sailed across the right-hand British sea, he came to . . . Germanus. . . .†

ibi statuerunt hyemali frigore, et de hoc nominatus est campus Tabern, i.e., Campus Tabernaculorum.—Colgan's "Secunda Vita," cap. i.

Causa haec erat primi . . . adventus ejus in Scotiam. Scotensis exercitus classe de more conducta, stipataque multitudine navium cum frequenter transnavigasset in Britanniam, multos inde ducebat captivos. Et hoc idem solito faciens . . . puer cum sorore sua . . . duceretur in Scotiam.—"Secunda Vita," cap. xi.

Tempore quo fueram puella in Britannia in Patria mea Nemthor. . . . —"Secunda Vita," cap. xvi.

* 5. Ut supra No. 4, the first and second clause.

Patricius igitur, qui vocabatur et Suchet, de genere Britonum ortus fuit, et non longe a mari est Patria ipsius, et locus in quo natus est consistit: cujus Pater Calburnius, filius Potiti venerabilis viri: Mater vero ejus Conches dicebatur.—"Tertia Vita," cap. xii.

† 6. Quidam Sanctum Patricium ex Judæis dicunt originem duxisse. . . . Sed . . . parentes ejus in Regionem Statoclude perrexerunt.

7. St. Patrick, who was also called Sochet, was by birth a Briton : in which country having suffered many things in his youth, he became a source of salvation to all his nation and fatherland. He was born in the Britains, his father being Calpurnius, a deacon, the son of Potitus, a priest, and his mother's name was Concessa, of the village of Bannaue, of the district of Taburnia, not far from the western sea : which village we have beyond doubt found to be in the province of Nentria, wherein of old giants are said to have dwelt.

While Patrick was as yet in fatherland with his father Calpurnius, and his mother Concessa, and with his brother Ructhi, and his sister Mila, in their city Arimuric, there was great disturbance there ; for the sons of King Rethmit from Britain laid waste Arimuric . . . murdered Calpurnius with his wife Concessa, and carrying off captive their sons Patrick and Ructhi, with their sister went into Ireland.*

8. A certain man, Calphurnius by name, son of Potitus, a priest, a Briton by nation, lived in a country called Taburnia, that is Campus tabernaculorum, for the reason that the Roman army had there erected their tents, and near the town Emphthor, having his dwelling on the borders of the Irish sea. He had married Conquessa, a French girl . . . they had a son . . . Patrick.

The place is famous, situated in the valley of the Clyde, called in the language of that people, Dun-Breaton, *i.e.*, the Rock of the Britons.

In qua terra conceptus et natus est Patricius, patre Kalfurnio ex matre Conchessa, ut ipse testatur in lib. Epist. Sanctus ergo Patricius in oppido Nemthor nomine, quod "Turris Coelestis" latine interpretari potest, natus fuit. Quod oppidum in Campo taburniae est, qui Campus tabernaculorum dicitur, eo quod in eo Romanus exercitus, quodam tempore tabernacula constituerit. Britannica autem lingua, Campus Tabern, idem Campus tabernaculorum dicitur.—Colgan's "Quarta Vita," cap. i.

In illo tempore classes Hiberniensium ad Britanniam causa praedandi transnavigare solebant. . . . Contigit ut venerabilis puer inter caeteros cum sorore sua Lupita captivus illuc duceretur.—"Quarta Vit," cap. xv.

Cum puella eram in Patria mea, scilicet in Britannia. . . .—"Quarta Vita," cap. xx.

Et his gestis elevato velo prospero flatu ad Britannicos sinus pervenerunt . . . cap. xxiii. . . . Perveniens ergo Sanctus ad parentes suos paucos dies cum eis mansit. . . . cap. xxv. Dehinc, ut ab angelo admonitus fuerat, transnavigato mari Britannico dextro . . . pervenit ad Germanum . . . cap. xxvi.

* 7. Sanctus Patricius, qui et Sochet vocabatur, Brito fuit natione, in qua etiam multa adversa in adolescentia perpeusus, omni genti sua ac patriae factus est in salutem. Hic in Britanniis natus est a patre Calpurnio Diacono, qui fuit filius Potiti Presbyteri : et matre Concessa nomine : de vico Bannaue Tiburniae regionis, haud procul a mari occidentali : quem vicum indubitanter comperimus esse Nentriae provinciae, in qua olim gigantes habitasse dicuntur.—"Quinta Vita," cap. i.

Cumque adhuc esset in patria cum patre Calpurnio et mater Concessa, fratre etiam Ructhi et sorore Mila nomine, in civitate eorum Arimuric, facta est seditio magna in partibus illis. Nam filii Rethmiti regis de Britannia vastantes Arimuric . . . jugulaverunt Calpurnium et uxorem ejus Concessam ; filios autem eorum Patricium et fratrem ejus Ructhi una cum sorore captivos abducentes Hiberniam ingressi sunt. . . . cap. xii

Those desirous of knowing about the miracle (which Patrick had wrought) need not be ignorant of it, seeing that all his countrymen so often speak of it.*

9. St. Patrick by origin was of the Strathclyde Britons. Calphurnius was his father's name . . . Potitus, his grandfather's . . . his mother was Conchessa . . . Nemthur, which etymologically taken signifies heavenly tower . . . was fatherland and birthplace to the infant.

By command of his steward, the . . . nurse of Patrick, had to go, the holy boy accompanying her, to sweep the prince's hall in the town of Alclud.

Certain of the British inhabitants of the Strathclyde river came from the greater Britain to visit their relations and friends in Armorican Britain. . . . Amongst them were Calphurnius . . . and Conchessa. . . . They were killed by the sons of Fectmagius. . . . Patrick, Lupita and Tigrida, his two sisters, were carried off captives (to Ireland). . . .

I (Lupita says to Patrick), when a little girl, was in my native town, Nemthor, in Britain. . . .

Then Patrick returned to his native country and friends . . . moved by these visions. . . . At 30 years of age . . . he crossed over the Ictian sea into France. . . . †

10. Patrick, who was also called Sochet, a Briton by nation, was born in the Britains, begotten of Cualfarnus, a deacon, son, as he himself saith, of Potitus, a priest, who was from the village *Ban navem thabur indecha*, not far from our sea, which village we have constantly and

* 8. Extitit vir quidam, Calphurnius nomine, filius Potiti Praesbyteri, Brito natione, in Pago Taburnia vocabulo, hoc est tabernaculorum Campo, eo quod Romanus exercitus tabernacula fixerit ibidem, secus Nemphthor degens, mari Hibernico collimitans habitatione. Hic duxerat in matrimonium puellam Francigenam, Conquessam nomine . . . protulerunt filium . . . Patricium. . . .—"Sexta Vita," cap. i.

Est autem locus celebris in valle Clud situs, lingua gentis illius, Dun-Breaton, i.e., "Mons Britonum" nuncupatus; signum scire sitientes non sinit latere, utpote toties divulgatum a patriotis omnibus.—Cap. xi.

† 9. De Britannis Alcludensibus originem duxit Sanctus Patricius Calphurnius patri . . . nomen erat . . . avo Potitus . . . Conchessa . . . ejus mater fuit. . . . Nemthur, quod ex vocis etymo coelestem turrem denotat . . . infantulo . . . patria et nativitatis locus fuit.—"Septima Vita," cap. i.

Mandante ejus oechonomo, debuit . . . Patricii nutrix ipso sancto puero comitante aulam Principis in Alcludensi oppido verrere.—Cap. xv.

Venerunt quidam ex Britannis Alcludani fluminis accolis, ex Britannia, nempe majori, ad visendos suos cognatos et amicos in Britannia Armorica. . . . Inter quos erant Calphurnius . . . et Conchessa . . . qui per filios Fectmagii interfecti sunt. . . . Patricius, ejusque duas sorores, Lupita et Tigrida capti. . . . Cap. xvi.

Ego, cum parvula existens puella, essem in Nemthor patrio oppido in Britanniam.—Cap. xxi.

Tunc Patricius reversus est ad patriam et amicos . . . Cap. xxx. His . . . visionibus motus . . . annum jam aetatis attingens trigessimum . . . profectus est ultra mare Iccium in Franciam. . . . Cap. xxxi.

beyond doubt found to be ventre, conceived also of a mother called Concessa.

. . . . Detained in slavery six years (in Ireland) In his twenty-third year he sailed to the Britains in the ship prepared for him. . . . And again after a few years, as before, he rested with his parents in his own native country And he was thirty years of age going forth to visit and to honour the Apostolic See, to the head, therefore, of all the churches of the whole world having, therefore, sailed across the right-hand British sea. . . . *

11. St. Patrick was born in the island of Britain, his father's name being Calpuirn. . . . St. Patrick, by race a Briton. . . . †

12. Patrick's race was of the Britons of Ailcluade. . . . At Nemthur now was he born. . . . The holy Patrick was reared at Nemthur. (His foster-mother was ordered) to cleanse the hearth of the palace at Ailcluade. ‡

13. Patrick's father was of the Britons of Alcluaid and in Nemthur he was born.

14. In a village, the name of which is Hurnia, in Britain, near the city of Emptor, Patrick was born.

15. Patrick, begotten of Calpurnius, his father conceived of his mother, Concessa near the castle of Dumbarton was born at Kilpatrick in Scotland, near the said castle and at baptism called Suthat. . . . §

16. Patrick was born in Britain, in the Campus tabernaculorum, his

* 10. Patricius, qui et Sochet vocabatur, Brito natione, in Britannia natus, Cualfarni diaconi ortus, filio, ut ipse ait, Potiti presbyteri, qui fuit vico *Ban navem thabur indecha*, ut (? haud) procul a mari nostro, quem vicum constanter indubitanterque comperimus esse ventre, matre etiam conceptus Concesso nomine.—"Documenta," cap. i. p. 21.

Qui sexennem . . . in servitute detentus . . . in navi sibi parata . . . aetatis suae anno xxiii. ad Britannias navigavit . . . Cap. i. pp. 21. 22. . . . Et iterum post paucos annos ut antea in patria sua propria apud parentes suos requievit. . . . Et erat annorum triginta egressus ad sedem apostolicam visitandam et honorandam, ad caput itaque omnium ecclesiarum totius mundi . . . transnavigato igitur mari dextro Britannico . . . —Cap. iv. et v. pp. 23, 24.

† 11. S. Patricius nascitur in Britania insula, ex patre nomine Calpuirn. . . . S. Patricius, genere Britus . . . —Pertz "Monumenta," vol. vii. p. 540, ex *Mariano Scot.*

‡ 12. This and the following two authorities are quoted from the Bishop of Ossory's Article. The writer is not within reach of the originals to give their own words. This is from a homily on the Saint's life, composed before the twelfth century. The following extract (13) is from an ancient Celtic homily in the "Book of Lismore," which is described by O'Curry in his "Lectures on the MS. Materials," pp. 196-200, and which contains many records of the early Irish Church. The third (14) is a short but very ancient notice, which O'Curry found among our old Irish MSS. See DUBLIN REVIEW, 1880, pp. 298-300.

§ 15. Patricius. . . . ex patre Calphurnio ortus matre Concessa apud castellum de Dumbertane conceptus et in Kilpatrick propo idem castellum in Scotia natus in baptismo Suthat nominatus. . . . —"Aberdeen Breviary," March, printed 1509.

father being Calphurnius, his mother Conquessa reared in Nempthor town. . . . He was taken by pirates sold in Ireland returned into Britain and by divine counsel received through his guardian angel he went to the Gauls. . . .*

17. St. Patrick was born in that town of Britain called Emptor. . . . Patrick was therefore born exactly in the Campus Taburnus, and it was called Tiburnius for the reason that in it of old the tents of the Roman army were set up. . . . The holy infant was brought up in Emptor.†

18. St. Patrick was born in a maritime district of Britain, which is over against Ireland sold (in Ireland) to merchants of Gaul, who brought him to a city of *lesser* Britain. . . .‡

19. Patrick born in a seaside district of Britain, captured by pirates from Ireland sold to merchants of Gaul, by whom he was brought to the city of Tours of *lesser* Britain. . . .§

20. Patrick, Apostle of the Irish, was in his youth carried off captive from the Island of Great Britain. . . .||

21. Patrick being come of most devout parents of Great Britain island. . . .¶

After carefully studying this mass of concurring evidence, it must be difficult for the reader to repress his feelings of amazement, that any one, who at all respects the veracity of the old

* 16. Patricius in Britannia natus in tabernaculorum Campo ex Calphurnio patre, matre vero Conquessa nutritus in Nemthor-oppido. . . . A piratis capitur in Hiberniam venditur reversus in Britanniam suscepto per Angelum custodem divino oraculo, Galliarum fines adivit—The Office of St. Patrick, printed at Paris, 1622. Colgan's "Trias Thaum," p. 189.

† 17. Natus est Sanctus Patricius in illo Britanniae oppido, nomine Emptor Patricius igitur singulatim in Campo Taburno est natus; et ab hoc Tiburnius dictus est, quia in eo quondam Romanorum exercitus tabernacula fixa sunt. . . . Sanctus infans in Emptor nutritus est —From a very ancient Breviary of Armagh. Colgan's "Trias," p. 192. According to a test used by Mr. Skene, "Celtic Scotland," vol. ii. p. 441, footnote—and he is not given to overrate the dates of Irish writings—this Office would date back at least to the tenth century.

‡ 18. S. Patricius natus in maritimo territorio Britanniae, quod Hiberniam respicit venditus (in Hibernia) mercatoribus Galliae, qui ipsum adixerunt ad *minoris* Britanniae civitatem. . . . —From the Office of the Church of Rheims, printed there, 1612. Colgan's "Trias," p. 194.

§ Patricius in maritimo Britanniae territorio natus, ab Hiberniae piratis captus est Galliae mercatoribus venditus a quibus Turonensem *minoris* Britanniae urbem vectus —From a more ancient Rheims Office. Colgan's "Trias," p. 195.

|| 20. Patricius, Hibernorum Apostolus, ex Britannia magna insula adolescens ductus est in captivitatem.—From the Office of the Lateran Canons Regular, printed 1635. Colgan's "Trias," p. 195.

¶ 21. Patricius ex Britannia magna insula religiosissimis parentibus originem trahens.—From an older Office of the Canons Regular, printed at Brussels in 1622, Colgan. "Trias," p. 195.

Catholic writers of Ireland, could be found to combat the statement of historic fact with which this article set out. The evidence as to St. Patrick's birthplace given by the above adduced authorities will be brought more forcibly under consideration by now analyzing and summing up what they say. For brevity's sake the number set before each is given in place of the name. Some of the authorities make the same statement more than once.

That St. Patrick was born in Britain is shown from them all except from the Hymn of Fiace; and the plural form (Britanniæ) as to his birth is used by two (7, 10), and as to his fatherland by (1) himself; and the Island of Britain by (11, 20, 21); and that his country was Britain in contradistinction to Armorican, or lesser Britain, *i.e.*, Brittany, by (1, 2, 9, 10, 18, 19); that he was born at or near Nemthur (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17); that Nemthur was in, or that he was born in, Tabernia (there are different spellings of this word, but that they mean the same place there can be no doubt) (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17); the same derivation of this name is given by (4, 5, 6, 8, 17); that Nemthur was Alclyde (that is Dumbarton) or near it is seen from (3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15); that the Campus Tabern was in Strathclyde is seen from (6, 8); that the place of his birth was near the sea (5, 18, 19); not far from the Western Sea (7); not far from the Irish Sea (8); our sea (10); maritime district of Britain (18, 19); over against Ireland (18); he had to cross the sea to reach France from his fatherland (6, 9, 10, 18, 19); he was born at Kilpatrick (15) in Scotland.

Two conclusions must follow from this great body of evidence. First, St. Patrick was born in Britain, not in Brittany, nor in any part of France. Second, St. Patrick was born at or near Dumbarton on the Clyde, and not at Bath on the Avon.

Now, how does the neighbourhood of Dumbarton agree with what is said of it by these ancient writers, who, with the exception of the Saint himself, apparently never saw it? Their descriptions, in every particular, tally with what we know of or learn from history concerning the locality. It is at the mouth of the Clyde, on the borders of the western, the Irish sea, over against Ireland. It is in tempting proximity, with its rich *curses* of cultivated land, to depredators from Erin. It is a place where the Roman armies must have frequently been. The wall of Antonine, beginning at Abercorn on the Forth, ended here on the Clyde. These would of necessity have been the two most important posts on the Northern Wall, for not only did the wall, but also the shores of the two estuaries, require to be defended. The derivation of the name Tabernia is not a surprise, then, but what might be expected. It was called *campus tabernaculorum*, we are told, from the tents set up on it by the

Roman army. We find in the parish of Kilpatrick * and in the small parishes grouped around it, and along the Roman wall, proof of the correctness of this derivation. The Gaelic for tent is *both*, also spelt *buth*. Now in deeds of lands in Kilpatrick as far back as the twelfth century, we find Cultebuthe, spelt also Cuiltebut and Culbuthe, and Thombothy. There is also Dunnerbowk, which seems to be a corrupt form of the word *both*.

What would one naturally expect to find among the Catholic population of a country where a great saint was known to have been born? Surely there should be found some cult of the saint, some church or at least an altar dedicated to his name, some practices of devotion to him, some connection of his name with localities in the district, pilgrimages to his altar, to his church, and such like profitable keeping alive of his memory. This is precisely what one finds in ancient Strathclyde, and finds nowhere else in regard to St. Patrick's birth. The Britons of the Strath did not forget their saintly fellow Briton. The church of Kilpatrick was dedicated to him and richly endowed. The parish church of Dumbarton, a chapel in the Castle, and other four or five churches can still be proved to have been dedicated to him in the kingdom of the Britons of Strathclyde. The church of Kilpatrick with its rich endowments, according to the lamentable custom of those days in endowing religious houses, was granted before 1227 by Maldoven, Earl of Lennox, to the monastery of Paisley. This, no doubt, was a lasting loss to the Saint's church, and served to lessen his memory in his native district. Lands belonging to the church were, at the end of the twelfth century, held by Beda Ferdan (who lived by the Clyde in a large house of wattle) and three other persons, who were bound for all service to receive and entertain pilgrims or strangers coming to the church of St. Patrick. A few paces from the cemetery of Kilpatrick is the Saint's well, of which miracles are related in his "Lives," and over which his church of old was built. In the river, opposite the church, "there is a large stone or rock, visible at low water, called St. Patrick's Stone," connected with a legend "that St. Patrick's vessel struck upon it in full sail on setting out to Ireland, and sustained no injury." Cardross, the parish contiguous to Dumbarton, was dedicated to St. Mahew, considered to be Maccus, a companion of St. Patrick. This, then, is the evidence of the veneration to the Saint at and near Alcluaid, in what was of old called the "Field of Tents," in Strathclyde.

The objections and difficulties of opponents have now to be

* For what is stated here and in the following paragraph, see "Origines Paroch. Scotiæ," vol. i., under the parishes of Kilpatrick, Dumbarton, Cardross, &c.

discussed and met, and the worthlessness of their theories shown. Not one of them pretends to find in any ancient writer a direct statement in his favour. It is by arguments of more or less, generally less, weight, they strive to build up an ill-cemented fabric, which is toppled down by the first adversary. They seize on an isolated passage. They "ring the changes" on the etymological derivation and signification of words and parts of words. They say that this letter may be dropped, that one changed into another, that this prefix is really a part of the preceding, that affix of the following word, and they have Latin Celticized and Celtic Latinized, and British and Cymric, and Irish and Scottish Gaelic to go and come upon. Even with all these methods, if the tortured words cannot be made to assume the desired form and meaning, India is not too distant for the "perfidious imagination of the Celt" to go to for an argument on a word which none could gainsay. These ways of maintaining a theory of themselves sufficiently condemn it. The plain simple truth requires no such devices. Alclyde is mentioned, France or Bath are not.

Every new theory is but the theory of a day, and each is also the theory of a new place. They cannot be condemned for their monotony. We have always a change of scene. That is about the best that can be said of them. Lanigan broke away from the received birthplace. His followers give enough variety of locality to satisfy the most fastidious of choice. Mr. Cashel Hoey overthrew Mr. Lanigan's positions. Mr. Lynch, oblivious of Mr. Hoey's efforts, fixed upon Tours, but every one threw stones at him and at Tours. Father Morris comes forward in a large-minded, philanthropical sort of way, and not to vex his readers "concerning the precise place" of St. Patrick's birth, allows them to choose as they please provided they choose in Gaul. Father Malone, without a word of thanks, nay, without a word of notice, passes over unceremoniously the benevolence of his theorizing predecessor, turns his back upon France altogether, contemptuously even, and brings us *nolens volens* to Bath. But the birthplace is as shifting and restless here as in France. The "Martyrologium Anglicanum" * says Bristol, the editors of the "Senchus Mor" † say Glastonbury. Does not this all put one vividly in mind of the parable of the house built on sand? At the first rough touch down topples their badly devised superstructure. A rolling stone gathers no moss. Lanigan set this stone latterly a rolling. It has gathered no force of argument on its way. Now that Father Malone has sent it plump into the

* Colgan's "Trias," cap. ii, p. 221. He does not commend this theory.

† O'Hanlon, "Lives of the Irish Saints," vol. iii. p. 467.

"thermal" springs of Bath, it is to be hoped that it may remain there, buried and forgotten.

A preliminary argument of a negative kind, made use of by Father Morris, is historically untrue. It crops up at long rambling intervals, and is an exaggerated description of the ravages committed by Pictish and Irish invaders of Valentia. The devastation was so universal and the seizure of country so complete, that the contention is that no Briton could have remained in the neighbourhood of Dumbarton to be the father of St. Patrick. Mr. Skene in "*Celtic Scotland*" has treated, if not exhaustively, very ably, the Roman occupation of Valentia. The Emperor Theodosius, A.D. 368, restored this province, driving the Scots to Ireland and repelling the Picts, rebuilt the Northern Wall, and formed the natives into cohorts of the Roman army. Clemens Maximus revolted in Britain A.D. 383, and, before crossing into Gaul with the British army, repressed the incursions of the Picts and Scots. Stilicho, at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, drove back the invading tribes, and recovered the territory up to the Northern Wall.* And after the Romans had left, never again to return, the Britons were so numerous and powerful, that they formed themselves into a kingdom with the city of Alcluaid, Dumbarton, for its seat. Of it Bede says in his day, "*civitas Brettonum munitissima*," the most strong city of the Britons. St. Patrick's very name is suggestive of the troubled state of the country in which he was born, for at baptism his parents called him Succath—*i.e.*, god of war. He waged a better war than they probably dreamt of.

I. St. Patrick was born in Britain. No, says Father Morris, but in France. It is proved, he insists, that writers used the name (Britannia) for a part of France, and in each case we must learn from the context which Britain is meant. But St. Patrick himself and others use the plural form (Britanniæ), the Britains. Yes, he admits that St. Jerome, for instance, adopts the singular (Britannia) in referring to Great Britain, while Bede uses singular or plural at will.† And thus briefly he passes from a point which is one of life and death for his theory. How disingenuous too! No one questions the fact of the singular or plural form having been used at will as to Great Britain, the question is as to Gaul. The plural cannot correctly be used, and it has not been shown that it ever was used by any writer for any part of France. Now the Saint himself and two other (7, 10) ancient writers use the plural form as to his native land, and this is fatal to Father Morris's contention. But this it not all; there is in the case a

* Skene's "*Celtic Scotland*," vol. i. p. 103, *et seq.*

† DUBLIN REVIEW, January 1883, p. 13.

cumulative argument of overpowering force. It was in a rare case, and by few writers, that Britannia, without a qualifying epithet, was used for Brittany. Twenty authorities have been given who call St. Patrick's native country Britannia. How is it that by no accident do they apply a qualifying noun or adjective to show they mean Britain in Gaul? On other occasions they multiply words to make certain that it is Brittany they allude to. Furthermore, not one of them has been shown to have used Britannia even in the singular, without qualification, for Brittany on any occasion. Other writers may have done so, they have not. This is decisive against France.

The curious thing is that France has never seriously claimed for herself the glory of being St. Patrick's fatherland. This honour is thrust on her by strangers, and these strangers are but of yesterday. She points to no place within her bounds, sanctified from an unknown date, as the birthplace of the Irish apostle. So much the better; the freer the scope for the historical theorist to look out for happy hunting grounds. Father Morris knew well that no place in France offered him any firm ground for a buttress to prop up his edifice, and he leaves his readers the delightful occupation of hunting out the right spot to build on for themselves. He knew besides that the evidence of France is in favour of Scotland. Colgan gives us the oldest French offices he could find, as noticed above—viz., of Paris (16), and two of Rheims (18 and 19), and they carefully state that he was born in Britain, and how he was brought thence to France. There is no answer to this French evidence. The corrected Breviary of Rouen has "in Britannia Gallicana," but this, as even Lanigan admits, is attributable to the corrector or rather corruptor of the Breviary.*

The only Life that has any semblance of supporting the French theory is that by Probus (7—see second paragraph), cap. xii. Here the word *Arimuric* is sought to be interpreted as if it stood for *Armorica*. Now if Probus meant *Armorica*, it is evident that he has blundered. He himself had already stated that St. Patrick was born in the Britains (in *Britanniis*), and as above, shown the plural is never used for Brittany. Two authorities (3, 9) state that the Saint was taken captive to Ireland from *Armorica*, but they are particular in telling that his native country was *Strathclyde* in Britain. Probus has made some omission, having probably meant to say what these two authorities say. There is, moreover, a great divergence in this part of Probus from every other Life. He has previously recounted the first captivity in Ireland, the escape, the three days' sail to his fatherland, the twenty-seven days' journey through the desert,

* Rev. Duncan McNab's "Archæological Dissertation," p. 22.

and thereafter a second captivity of sixty days. This is so far in agreement with the Saint's own account in the "Confession," and with all the Lives. But then Probus gives a third captivity from this disputed Arimuric, and bestows upon the Saint a brother Ructhi and a sister Mila, nowhere else heard of, and treats him to a ten days' sail from Ireland to Brotgalum, and thence a journey to Trajectus, and he makes him come in priest's orders to preach for a time in Ireland. There is no authority but Probus for these statements. No one seems to think Probus correct in stating that St. Patrick, while only a priest, laboured in Ireland. If in calling Arimuric the Saint's fatherland, Armorica is meant, Probus contradicts himself and all the quoted authorities, not only in the direct, but also in the indirect evidence they give, and the latter is often the stronger. When they place his birthplace on the western sea, near the sea, our sea, the Irish sea, over against Ireland, that bars any place in France. When they (the *Vita Secunda*, *Vita Tertia*, 6, 10, 16) tell us that on leaving his father's house, he had to cross the right-hand British sea to reach France, or an equally unmistakable phrase, they finally settle the British birthplace of the Saint. But to add "confusion worse confounded," Father Morris adopts this unsupported and erroneous passage from Probus as if it were a firm foundation to build upon, and, worse than this, tacks on to it a passage that does not belong to it, and inserts a date that does not apply to it. In fact, he tries "to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds." Where Probus suits him, he is all for Probus. Where Probus does not suit him, he will have none of Probus. Probus states, before this Brotgalum voyage, that St. Patrick was thirty years of age. Father Morris makes him but twenty-two after it.

St. Patrick in the "Confession," and Probus in his *Life*, make the twenty-seven days' journey through the desert occur after the first captivity, and after a three days' voyage. Could a ship of those days, coasting the whole way, as they mostly did, reach France in three days? Father Morris makes the Saint say of the journey from Trajectus to Tours, after a ten days' voyage, "for twenty-seven days we travelled through a desert." The Saint never mentions Brotgalum, Trajectus, or Tours. Probus, who is the sole authority for the journey, simply says: "and flying thence he came to Martin the Bishop at Tours." Theories so supported are self-condemned.

II. St. Patrick was born near Dumbarton, at old Kilpatrick, on the Clyde. No, says the Very Rev. Sylvester Malone, but at Bath.* After making mention of six places, which claim St.

* Here and throughout Father Malone's article in the DUBLIN REVIEW of October last is referred to.

Patrick as a native, he modestly says: "We shall have occasion to bring forward a seventh place, whose claims we have not yet seen advocated." He, in this nineteenth century, after all the writings and controversies about St. Patrick, after willing predecessors "prospecting" at Bristol and at Glastonbury in his neighbourhood—after Lanigan, and Hoey, and Lynch, and Father Morris careering over the whole seaboard of France, he alone—"alone I did it"—has at long last discovered the birthplace of St. Patrick. "Prodigious!" as our scholar, Dominie Samson, would have said. Soberly speaking, this state of the case is, without other refutation, a sufficient condemnation of the Bath theory.

To clear the way for this theory, the arguments deduced by the Bishop of Ossory from the ancient writers given above have to be met, the positive statements of these writers have to be overborne. How has this unenviable task been accomplished? Father Malone admits the identification of Nemthur with Alclyde (3) by a scholiast on the Hymn of Fiacc. To damage the scholiast's credit (if not, why else?) he applies to him the epithet *nameless*. That the derogatory epithet may stick the faster he repeats it, "the testimony of a *nameless* scholiast." And to fasten it beyond removal he returns to it a third time, "a remark even from a *nameless* scribe." Is this historical criticism? Is the scholiast's evidence, "more than a thousand years old," to be destroyed by a blow of this sort from a countryman of to-day. The name, if known, might add to the authority of his words, but, being unknown, does it follow that his statement—Nemthur is Alclyde—is untrue? Some books even of the Bible were written by *nameless* scribes. Alas for the *Lives of the Irish Saints*—alas for the ancient manuscripts of Erin, if we are to discard all whose authors are to us nameless! Is it to be a sufficient answer, when we advance a statement on history, on doctrine, on religious or secular custom from an ancient Irish manuscript, that it was written by a nameless scribe? The scribe, though nameless, is a witness of a thousand years ago. The scribes, as a rule, were ecclesiastics. There was then no controversy on the question. They wrote what they knew was believed in Ireland in their day. This is all-important against Bath.

A direct attack is made on the trustworthiness of the scholiast, but with like ill-success. He is to be judged by the other scholia. In one of them five sisters are given to St. Patrick, which is in conflict with St. Evin, "one of the oldest biographers of the Saint," and Jocelin, who give him but three, as well as with Probus as to names. This being so, "it is not too much to suspect a verbal mistake as to Nemthur or Alclyde." Was there ever a

conclusion drawn from faultier premises? No error is proved against the scholiast as to the intricate matter of these relatives, the error may be with the other side, and it is concluded that he is in error as to Alclyde. Let it be noted, by the way, that both St. Evin and Jocelin (9, 8 *) are strong witnesses for Alclyde. But there is a more monstrous critical injustice against Father Malone. The scholia on Fiacc's Hymn were not all written by the same person. The Bishop of Ossory † takes pains to explain this, and to explain that the scholium about the relatives of the Saint is of later date than the one identifying Nemthur with Alclyde, and is not to be found in the best MS., while the earlier one is. It is, therefore, the gloss of an older writer. By what sort of critical economy was this passed over, and the *nameless* scholiast condemned for what another scholiast wrote?

The Bishop of Ossory cites three other authorities (9, 12, 13) who identify Nemthur with Alclyde. This is met by an attempt at wholesale "poisoning of the wells." During and after St. Columba's labours in Scotland, numbers of Irish were wont to come over to Scotland, and, seeing churches and holy wells dedicated to St. Patrick, the country redolent with his name, "we can easily see how a remark, even by a nameless scribe, would be taken up and repeated in the tenth century." This writer delights in assertion. This is not argument, but a gratuitous assertion that his countrymen concocted the identification, after the manner of the "three black crows." He is complimentary throughout to his countrymen and their hagiographers. He here accuses them of having forgotten the Saint's real birth-place! How did the many Irish who frequented Glastonbury, where relics of another Patrick were, fail to keep fresh the memory of Bath so near at hand? How were the Britons of Strathclyde prevailed upon to take a stranger, the apostle of their foe, as the patron of their capital, and give him hard by a birth-place, a church over his baptismal well, and an abundant endowment thereto? What absurdities a false theory leads one into from expected and unexpected quarters!

Authorities (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17,) state that Nemthur was in, or that St. Patrick was born in, Tabernia. There are minor differences of spelling among them, but there is no question but that they all refer to the same place. Five give the same derivation for the name (4, 5, 6, 8, 17). Two (6, 8) place this Tabernia on the Clyde. Four identify (3, 9, 12, 13) Nemthur

* Whenever such figures occur in this paper, the reader is invited to look back, and re-read the authority signified, and so see for himself that nothing is asserted beyond what is proved. The truth here requires no straining of evidence.

† DUBLIN REVIEW, April 1880, pp. 294, 295.

and Alclyde, and so prove the *locale* of Tabernia. Four (3, 6, 8, 9) say he was of the Strathclyde Britons. Father Malone cannot shut his eyes to the force of all this, and makes awkward attempts to discredit the witnesses. He calls them writers who lived 500 years after St. Patrick. He does not in the least prove they did. If this avails, the writer he altogether depends upon lived 600 years, and he himself 1,300 years, after the Saint. He condemns the ancient derivation of the name. It is not distinctive enough. The Romans encamped in so many places "from Sandwich to the wall of Antoninus." It is then unreasonable to call this place alone "*campus tabernaculorum*." Truly a feeble argument. How is one river called Avon (river), another not? How is one stream called Esk (Uisge, *i.e.*, water), another not? How are several hills called Benmore and Morven (large hill), when greater ones are not? To lean upon the why and wherefore of names is to lean upon a reed. But it is not the derivation, ancient or modern, that is of vital importance, but the locality indicated. And the witnesses, as above shown, speak unmistakably of the locality. When one speaks of Edinburgh, or Dublin, or Dumbarton, his knowledge of the derivation of the names may be ever so feeble, but the place spoken of he localizes otherwise beyond cavil. Is ignorance of derivation to upset what is directly said of these towns? Being in straits, Father Malone makes much of the different spelling of the word Tabernia, and of difference of prepositions used, as *in* and *near* Nemthur, and of the nouns used, "region," or "plain," or "district" of Tabernia. Who ever saw two MSS., even of the Bible, that have not such minor discrepancy? This discrepancy is always more visible as to proper names, because the sense enables one to read correctly other words. Because one says a plain, another a district, a third a region of Tabernia; because one says *in* Nemthur, another *near* Nemthur; the conclusion is forced upon him that "they have not hit on the true original reading." * How easily one is forced to go the way he wants, be it ever so perverse! When antiquarians doubt about a particular site of ancient Rome or Athens, they go to the spot to find light on the matter. Why did not our friend go to Dumbarton; there never has been doubt there. The Celtic word "both," so much desiderated by him, is still lingering in the names of the locality. Nemthur or Aleclyde, standing out on a promontory, it is not

* Father Malone is himself a living example of how easily one may slip into error. He, p. 317 of his article, quotes twice from the same passage of the Scholiast, as if quoting two writers, quotes wrongly, makes reference to the wrong page of Colgan, falls into the monstrous error of unsexing the grandfather of Patrick (Octmusius), making him his mother. Nothing like this occurs about the "*campus*." *Campus*, as in Champagne, or the Campagna, may be a *region*, *plain*, or *campus*.

very difficult to see that some might consider it only near the "campus tabernaculorum," while others, there being no water separation, might judge it to be in the said campus. The main objections against the unanimous testimony of Ireland, France, and Scotland, in favour of Strathclyde having been thus answered, a brief notice may be taken of what is called "direct proofs" against Kilpatrick.

The first proof is no proof at all. "Having, therefore (*igitur*, in other Lives, *dein*, and *deinde*) sailed across the right-hand British sea," does not imply "that he began his journey at once by water." The *igitur*, *dein*, or *deinde* express no haste. He was not far from the Forth. It is, however, against Bath, for sailing from the Bristol Channel he would not be on the "right-hand British sea" at all.

The second proof is not better than the first. St. Patrick (1) wrote of his desire to go to Britain to see his relatives, and not only thither but as far as the Gauls. The ingenuity is extreme which finds here an argument against Kilpatrick. But here it is: "He would, in going there (to Dumbarton) from Ireland, be only turning his back on Gaul." Why not? He does not speak of taking a straight line to the Gauls, but of first going to see his friends. In any case, there were Roman roads from the Clyde south well known to him, and the route seems then to have been from Ireland to the Continent through Scotland. We find St. Palladius took Scotland on his way to Rome, and died in it. Such a direct proof is easily disposed of.

Then there follows historical and philological heterodoxy of no ordinary kind. We are told that the region from the Humber to the Clyde was then in Argyle (Ainer Gael)! The people then were all Gaels, no British! The emigration from Ireland was so great in the third century as to accomplish this! Wonders will never cease! The truth is that the Irish were then called Scoti. The first mention of them in Scotland by Roman writers is in 360; and their colonization of Argyle was after St. Patrick's death at the end of the fifth century.* The distinction between Gaelic and Erse is news to the present writer. Gaelic is Erse, and Erse is Gaelic. St. Patrick, a Briton of the Strathclyde Britons, spoke their tongue and not that of the Scoti.

A difficulty is made of the Saint's saying that he was thrown at the end of the world, *extremis terrae*. That seems clear. The "Ultima Thule" was the end northwards. Ireland was the end (*pars extrema terrae*) westwards, nothing being known of beyond the wide Atlantic. Even the great voyager, St. Brendan, did not in his day discover America.

* Skene's "Celtic Scotland," vol. i. pp. 139, 140.

Prophecy is brought forward as a final blow against Scotland. Let the reader keep calm. There is still left a means of salvation. The Druids foretold Patrick's coming, and described him as a foreigner coming *over seas from afar* (*externum longinquo trans maria*). Father Malone concludes: "It does not appear applicable to one born on the Clyde, and separated from Ireland by merely thirteen miles of water." Is it applicable to one born at Bath, which, he argues afterwards, is *not far from* the Irish sea? This by way of home-thrust, not by way of answer. It is also news that one on the Clyde is but thirteen miles by water from Ireland. Father Malone again quotes incorrectly. He might have kindly given the noun agreeing with *externum*, which is not Patrick. But here is the passage: "*Profetabant morem quendam exterum . . . cum ignota quadam doctrina molesta longinquo trans maria advectum, &c.*"—"they prophesied that a certain foreign custom . . . with a certain unknown troublesome doctrine brought across the seas from afar." What an argument, and what a mistake! The custom was from afar, not Patrick. The sons of the Clyde bring things from afar to this day.

Leaving now behind us these nibblings, dignified by the name of direct proof, the crux of the contention is reached. Was Bath the birthplace of St. Patrick? Father Malone maintains it was. The object of his article was to prove it. In the "Book of Armagh" is a Life of the Saint dating as far back as 807. The first chapters are, as has been said, wanting. The Bollandists have found in Brussels a copy of this Life, which supplies the wanting chapters. On one word in this Brussels copy (*indecha*), Father Malone's theory is founded. He translates *indecha* by the adjective *Indian*. One is almost inclined to think that this is a squib on criticism as to the birthplace in question, rather than the outcome of sober historical research.

The passage is given above (10) in full. Four words of it (here again his quotation limps a little) are only required to be argued out: (*qui fuit vico*) *Ban navem thabur indecha*. He translates them thus: "(He was) of the Avon's mouth (village) of the Indian well." He knew that Bristol was at the Avon's mouth, nineteen miles down the river. How is that met? Thus: "We should bear in mind that the literal meaning of *bun*, as in *Bonavem*, is not a mouth but a bottom." It is difficult to see how *bottom* helps him. A village at the bottom of the Avon would be rather out of place. It is mere conjecture, it is not proved, that *ban* here is the Celtic word *bun*. If it is, the real meaning is *root* (of a tree or plant). It is applied metaphorically to a river-mouth. Up the trunk of a tree from the root the branches grow out to the right and left, as upwards

from the mouth of a river tributaries join it on each hand, but the *bun* is the lowest part of both. A town, or village, being of very limited extent, if named after a river-mouth, is always at it. Lands, being of indefinite extent, such as Bunratty barony, carry the name over this extent, however great. If a town extended twenty miles, it also would carry its name that distance. But each must begin near the river-mouth. But to call Bath, with towns intervening, and nineteen miles up, the Avon's mouth village is too absurd.

The Brussels MS. has *navem*, and one or more copies of St. Patrick's "Confession" have also *Bonavem*; Probus has *Bannaue*. The Bath theory requires absolutely that it should read *aven*, and that it should be not *aven* a common, but Avon a proper name, and be translated "the Avon." Here is a new economy for this theory. No ancient writer attempts a derivation. The true orthography is unknown, the true pronunciation is unknown, the true meaning is also unknown. No known person ever heard Bath called Bunavon. No known MS. or book calls Bath Bunavon. Bunaven is as good Celtic for hill-foot (*bun-a-ven*) as for river-foot. There is nothing in language more cheating than conclusions drawn from fancied resemblances to words in proper names. But let all this stand aside. Up starts Father Malone and Bath is Bunavon.

Of all the writers of Lives of our Saint no one has Thabur save the Brussels codex alone. The others have Tabernia or an equivalent. Our theorist is positive that they are all wrong, and that this Thabur is the genuine article. *Thabur* is translated *wells*. There is little use of going to Bath if not for the wells. But then *thabur*, or *tabur*, does not in Gaelic, nor in any known language, mean a *well*. As every Celt knows, or ought to know, *Tobar** is a well. *To*, not *ta*, is the way to spell it. It may be a corrupt spelling this *ta*. No. The corruption goes the other way, further from *a*, not nearer it. It becomes *tio*, *ti*, and *tu*. The present writer knows no example of *ta*. If such there be, has every word to be exceptionally treated for this brand new theory? *Tabur*, being once got, although it does not mean a *well*, it must mean a *well*, else Bath is lost.

Indecha, is an adjective, signifying, we are told, *Indian*; and in the "Leabhar Breac" *indechā* is found and there signifies Indian. This word is not found in any Life of Patrick except in the Brussels codex. It is again a case of Brussels against the world. Father Malone claims for it the authority of the "Book of Armagh," but this cannot at all be granted. He says that this

* In the "Tripartite Life" in Colgan, we have *Tobar-mucna*, *Tobar-stingle*, p. 137; *Tobar-enadhare*, p. 141; *Tiopra-Phadruic*, *Tipra-Phadruic*, p. 146; *Tibrad-cherua*, p. 163; *Tiprad Innse*, Scholiast on Fiacc.

Brussels copy "corresponds almost *literally*" with the "Book of Armagh." This is not so. Look at both in the "Documenta;" there are multitudes of *literal* and several *verbal* differences on every page. In this newly found Life we have *Curbia* as the town near which the Saint was consecrated bishop. The "Book of Armagh," and every other Life, differs from it here. *Curbia* was as unknown previously to critics as *indecha*. Though a *nameless* writer of the eleventh century, Father Malone smiles upon this copyist quite confidently, and yet he frowned down the *nameless* scholiast on Fiacc of the seventh or eighth. The copyist at the outset shows gross incapacity. In the prologue to the Life he makes a jumble of some account of St. Basil with what belongs to Patrick. His authority, then, in giving a word otherwise unknown is not great. In the "Book of Armagh" the "Confession" is given, where we read, "e vico Bonaven Taberniae villam," &c. Now the "Book of Armagh" is not supposed to contradict itself by giving two irreconcilable descriptions of St. Patrick's birthplace; therefore it gives no countenance to *indecha*.

Father Malone is disturbed that nowhere else is *indecha* to be found, and he performs a great feat in accounting for this. Why do the others write Taberniae and not Thabur indecha? It was thus. In some early MS. Thabur inde- was at the end of a line as in the Brussels codex. Gratuitous assertion one. Then they in some copy joined hands—Thaburinde. Ditto two. When soldiers in line turn right-about-face, those who were in front are in rear, and *vice versâ*. In performs a like movement and becomes *ni*—Thaburnide. Ditto three. *De*, the stem of the *d* not rising higher than the other letters but curving faintly to the left, gets easily mistaken for *ae*—Thaburniae. Ditto four. All sign of conjunction between *inde* and *cha* is lost, and *is cha* began a line and was useless by itself, it soon fades into nonentity. Ditto five and six. This was the way *Thabur indecha* became Taberniae! There are several MSS. of the "Confession," but as there is no sign of this process of conversion in even the earliest, it must have been completed before they were written. This brings us back close on the times of the Saint. With all other absurdities, we have to believe that writers wiped out indecha at a time when they best knew it ought to be retained. This performance brings vividly to mind that other, which Mr. Cashel Hoey, when identifying Tournehem with Nemthur, attributes to Fiacc. Of old it was Tur-n-hem. To suit the versification, the word had to turn deftly a literary summersault, and behold you have Nemtur. Everything is allowed in love and in war, and also, it would seem, for a theory.

The result of all this labour is : "He was of the Avon's mouth

village of the Indian well." "If I rightly interpret *indecha*," says Father Malone, "it means thermal or Indian. The *thabur indecha* would be 'Indian or thermal springs.'" There are thermal springs at Bath, and, therefore, it is the Saint's birth-place. "Now," he proceeds, "the 'Book of Armagh' tells us that the village so described was called as of Nentre." The "Book of Armagh" has not a word of the kind, but the Brussels codex (10) has "which village we have constantly and beyond doubt found to be ventre." Not *as of Nentre*, but *to be ventre*. This is another economy. But let us proceed to the surprise prepared for our enlightenment. The word is *ventre*. No matter. Our guide takes Nentre. He says that Nentre is British, and only a corruption of Nen-dwyre—i.e., "heavenly waters," *nen* in British signifying heavenly. *Nem*, not *nen*, is the British for heavenly. The error serves but by way of condiment to make the interpretation palatable. That the Irish called Bath "Indian well," and that the British called it "Heavenly waters," may be poetical and a fine fancy of a gifted imagination, but as matter of fact it has no shred of evidence in its favour. Which Briton called it "Heavenly waters?" No author is quoted, no MS. named. Where is the well, or lake, or sea, or river in Wales, or in all Britain, that any one ever heard called, or read of as being called, "Nen-dwyre" (heavenly waters)? Not even Taliessin, in his most fervid mood, sings of heavenly waters. Taliessin, however, has an angry stone thrown at him across the Bristol Channel. He is an independent witness in favour of the Clyde. He, never thinking of controversy or doubt on the point, sings how Rederech, his hero, sails to Nevtur,* and there, on the Clyde, fights his battle of victory. Unwearied in making assertions without proof, Father Malone endeavours to slaughter Taliessin by saying that this is "a repetition of the Irish MSS., and found only in comparatively modern manuscripts." Taliessin was an ancient, nevertheless, and the theory does not gain by mis-statements. The appeal to the British language fails in this disastrous manner. The name, indeed, is found, but it is found on the Clyde, though Bath was so much nearer Taliessin. As to "Indian well," all proof is equally wanting. Who ever heard Saxon or Celt, Pict or Scot, Gael or Briton, call Bath "Indian well"? Does any person, or did any person, in modern or ancient times, call a thermal spring an Indian well? In any Irish writer of any date, can it be found that any well was called Indian? It does not look like serious reasoning to make such assertions, but like poking

* Skene's "Four Ancient Books of Wales," vol. i.; and "Celtic Scotland," vol. ii. p. 436.

fun at us. In the Lives of Patrick many wells are spoken of; had the miraculous one of his baptism been a hot-water well, who can believe that it would have escaped all notice?

The Brussels codex in the end does not lead us to Bath. After the four words, so long dwelt on, we read that the birth-place mentioned was "not far (10) from our sea." This description of the locality is conclusive against Bath or Frome (either equally suits Father Malone, who is not more particular as to a fixed place than other theorists). He is not staggered by this description in the least. Not far from the Irish Sea; "nor is Bath," he answers, quite happily. "In fact," he adds, "a writer at the present day . . . could not describe it (the locality of Bath or Frome) more accurately than by saying to an Irishman that it was not far from the Irish Sea." The line must surely be drawn somewhere. Does he expect his readers to swallow camels by the dozen, while he strains at any gnat as to Strathclyde? Would any of H.M.'s Inspectors pass an answer of this kind from a child in a poor school—"Bath, otherwise 'Indian well,' or else 'Heavenly waters,' a village of Britain not far from the Irish Sea?" A chorus of ancient writers assist the description: "Not far from the sea;" "on the borders of the Western Sea;" "our sea;" "the Irish Sea;" "over against Ireland." This description of the birthplace is a sufficient and unanswerable condemnation of the Bath theory. The old Irish stretched the Ictian Sea along the south of England as far as Bath. Glastonbury is given as on the borders of the Sea of Icht,* and Bath is on the same sea. Seeing the long stretch of British coast opposite Ireland, and the many villages thereon, one must have lost his head to think that he was giving a true direction by passing all that coast and those villages by, and pointing out by the words "not far from the Irish Sea," a place at the head of the Bristol Channel, and (in a country of such seaboard) an inland town.

Should one, to investigate the matter, visit Somersetshire, what signs of any connection with St. Patrick would he find? Were there of old churches, chapels, wells, or any place bearing his name? The present writer finds none. The propounder of the theory mentions none. And at this day the English "Directory" of 1887 does not show one dedication to the Saint in the whole diocese of Clifton. If the absence of all signs and proofs of an alleged fact proves an allegation to be a fact, such exactly

* Cormac's "Glossary." See O'Curry's "Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish," vol. ii. p. 211. Father Malone quotes this very passage from the "Glossary," but, seeing a pitfall to his theory, stops short at the Ictian Sea. Is this commendable? Why did he not give, "Glastonbury, now a church on the brink of the Ictian Sea"?

is the sort of proof, and such the signs furnished us here to prove the Bath theory.

A very different state of matters is to be met with in Strathclyde. In the diocese of Glasgow now, eight churches and chapels of stations are dedicated to St. Patrick, while one of its nine deaneries is under his invocation. Of old, as already said, six or seven churches were dedicated to him, none of which disputed with that of Kilpatrick the honour which has ever been its glory. None of those who set up these new theories have made the least attempt to account for the old dedications. Except that this was the country of his birth, we fail to find in all the Lives any other connection of St. Patrick with Strathclyde. Take away this, and explain how it comes that he competes in churches with St. Mungo in his own diocese? Almost universally in Scotland the early dedications indicate a personal contact of the Saint named with the locality of the dedication. Antiquarians are agreed in noting this fact.

As bearing strongly upon this part of the question, as already hinted at, it should be noticed that the Britons of Strathclyde and the Irish were hostile nations. The Irish were wont, from a very early date, to make descents for the sake of plunder on the British coast here. When the Dalriads came over, shortly after the death of St. Patrick, and formed their kingdom in Argyle, the hostility became more continuous and marked. Camden says of Dumbarton. "This of old was Alelyde, but afterwards began to be called by the Britons, who for a long time held it against the Scots, Dunbritton, that is, the town of the Britons." * Is it likely that the Britons would take as their great saint the apostle of the enemy? Is it likely that they would even dedicate to him the chief church of their capital, and the chapel of their stronghold? It has to be borne in mind that among the Celts, and elsewhere, each tribe and nation claimed all the influence of their own saints against their enemies. From this it appears that the Saint had a very close connection with Strathclyde.

What object is gained by advocating such fancies? No doubt they tickle—such an one as this Indian well does—but they also irritate. Is it an argument, which commends itself to us Celts, to be told by Father Morris, "that it is the nation to which a man belongs (not the birthplace), which leaves its stamp upon his character;" and, according to him, that the important thing is that the Saint had no drop of our blood in his veins. But the Saint did not identify himself with the Roman, but with the British race. This is no dishonour to him or to his work. The Celts, on many great occasions, have shown that the blood of apostles pulsed through their warm and generous hearts.

* Camden's "*Britannia*," p. 666.

One church or parish, and one church alone, has ever claimed to be the church of St. Patrick's birthplace and baptism. For us, this is a great fact, and also a great proof. For some 800 years before the time of the Reformation this has been proved to have been the belief in Ireland. From that time downwards Irish writers testify to that belief and to no other. Every direct statement of theirs is in support of and not one adverse to this belief. No Irish finger until some sixty years since, pointed in any other direction. And now all their names of worth are in agreement with those of old. It wounds the Catholic mind to discredit a venerable, unbroken tradition of ages like this. If such a tradition of two countries, founded on such monuments, be worthless, what local tradition is worth a straw? Is it the part of a Catholic to maintain that the churches of the two nations have deceived, or have been deceived, or both, in a matter within their bounds, and touching them so nearly? Is Father Malone's argument one acceptable or creditable to the Irish people: that they forgot "during times of confusion and irruption from pagan barbarians" whence their apostle came? He had a firmer hold of their hearts than that. As the Jews protested regarding Jerusalem: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand be forgotten. Let my tongue cleave to my jaws if I forget thee," so would the Irish protest, in regard to Patrick. What is to be said of this remnant of Irish hagiographers, the ancient writers that have escaped from the fires of the Danes, the internal depredation of chief against chief, the struggles of the English conquest, and the pillage and devastation since the Reformation? That their authority is to be scouted? Such an idea is enough to awake in his grave the learned, the enthusiastic Irish scholar, the lamented O'Curry. On this point almost every old writer had before him, not only the tradition of Ireland, not only more ancient lives, but the words of the Saint himself. They do not profess doubt or hesitation about those words, but they point with unanimity to Strathclyde, and Strathclyde points, and ever pointed, to old Kilpatrick near Dumbarton on the Clyde as the birthplace of St. Patrick.

Had the Reformation never occurred, there would no doubt be still existing old usages and immemorial quaint devotions at Kilpatrick as at other shrines, testifying to the truth of a fact to which they bore living witness. But these, like the home life, as it were, of all our churches, are swept away. Since the tide of Irish emigration set in towards Scotland, it has filled the valley of the Clyde with many churches. Kilpatrick, unfortunately, has not been found suitable for any large works; no Irish have, therefore, gathered in or around it, and consequently it possesses no Catholic church. What a happy outcome of this controversy, should some zealous priest take up the cause of Kilpatrick, secure

a site as near the well as may be, and build a beautiful little church to the Saint! Among the thousands upon thousands of Irish in the diocese of Glasgow, is there one that would refuse an appeal for such a cause? Perhaps some one, blessed by God with means, may choose it as a work of love for himself alone, and raise a new sanctuary near the old. Then the pilgrim will frequent the place again. The old devotion there will be renewed. And for those who come with faith, relying upon the powerful intercession of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Erin, with God, wonders as of old, wonders of another order than those of the Bath "thermal springs," will doubtless be abundantly wrought by the clear, cool, sweet waters of the well of the Saint at Kilpatrick.

COLIN C. GRANT.

ART. VII.—ITALY, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

Italy: Present and Future. By A. GALLENGA. In Two Volumes. London: Chapman & Hall. 1887.

WHAT is the actual condition of the Italian Kingdom after its first quarter of a century of political existence? What are its prospects for the future? These are the questions that Mr. Gallenga has set himself to answer in his recently published work on "*Italy: Present and Future.*" At the very outset he reminds his readers that as long ago as 1841 he published another book in London under the title of "*Italy: Past and Present.*" It was his first work. Many of the hopes to which it gave expression have long since been realized. Italy is united, from the Alps to the Southern Sea, under the sceptre of a Piedmontese prince. Rome has become the capital, and the Sovereign Pontiff has been deprived of his temporal power. The Bourbons are gone from Naples, the Austrian princes from the Duchies, the Austrian armies from Venice and Milan. Italy claims to be one of the great Powers of Europe. Even though her naval record culminates with Lissa and her military glories with Custozza, she has a large army and a navy of colossal ironclads. True, there is also a huge debt, and its natural accompaniment, a crushing system of taxation; and, on the whole, the unifying process has been a very expensive one. Yet glory and greatness must be paid for. What is a Great Power without a national debt and a big budget?

Notwithstanding the realization of so many of his earlier hopes, M. Gallenga, in 1887, does not appear half so sanguine as he was in 1841. He has revisited Italy often since his first exile, and he has visited many other lands. The young enthusiast of the famous dagger episode has been forgotten in the successful journalist, the far travelled *Times* correspondent, to whom English has become like a native language, and who has, on many occasions, been the accepted teacher of the English public on foreign affairs other than those of Italy. Somehow, though still ready to take the most favourable view of the condition of his native country, he is far from satisfied with the results obtained in her first quarter of a century of unity and "freedom." All would come right if the Pope were only despoiled, and the Austrian and the Bourbon driven away. They are gone, and still things are far from being right; and the most hopeful view that M. Gallenga can take of the situation is that, "It will be *all right a hundred years hence*." But, unfortunately, there is some doubt if Italy will last so long.

Whatever causes may have contributed to it [says our author] Italy is now a *fait accompli*, a "thing done," and, as the French phrase seems to imply, "not to be undone;" a French phrase and very strange in the mouth of a nation which since 1789 has only been doing, undoing and doing over again.

Wiser people than the French know very well that Fate strikes eternal compacts with no man, with no man and no race of men; that in the life of nations regress is as inexorable a necessity as progress; that ideas and even principles have their course; and their phases are as changing as the seasons of the year, and the cycles of good and bad harvests. . . . Italy is made. Granted; but can nothing ever happen to *unmake* her. Italy is a nation. She has all the elements to be a *happy* nation. Is there any reason why she should not also be a *great* nation? It is to these questions that it seems to me important to seek a solution. Are there in that country the germs of true greatness? Is there even the basis of durable security? To achieve its mission a nation must, before all things, be sure of moral as well as of material independence. It must feel that, for defensive purposes at least, its existence is as safe as that of any of its neighbours. Has Italy, as yet, this consciousness of perfect safety? Is her edifice as solid as it is marvellous? In the country itself any doubt on that score would be rank blasphemy; but outside its boundaries that conviction is somewhat less deeply rooted. The existence of Italy as a self-governing country, her neighbours argue, has been recognized by all the European Powers; but it has been guaranteed by none. And indeed neither for Italy, nor for any other State, can there be a permanent compact of international assurance. A nation must stand either on its own strength or on its policy.

Let us see, then, what is the fighting strength of Italy—what

is the actual worth of that army and navy for which the new kingdom has made so many sacrifices. And then how far Italian policy is likely to secure the kingdom of Italy a permanent and respectable position among the Great Powers of Europe.

Italy, it must be confessed, has a very unfortunate military history. Since, in the Middle Ages, her republics began to hire German and Swiss mercenaries to fight their battles, Italian armies have known many defeats and few victories. A long record of disaster begins with Fornovo in 1495 and ends with Custoza in 1866. It is strange that this should be so, for many parts of Italy afford capital raw material for the making of soldiers, and among the great captains of Europe not a few have borne Italian names. For all that, unless when they fought side by side with allies from beyond the Alps, the armies of Piedmont and of Italy have marched only to defeat. True, in the wars of the first Napoleon, Italian *corps d'armée* fought with distinction in many parts of Europe; but they fought under foreign leaders and fought well, just as Sepoys led by English and French officers have met and conquered armies that they could not face for a moment if they were under a native rajah or chief instead of a European general. The desire to wipe out this dark record of the past by future victories has had something to do with the eagerness of the new kingdom to develop into a military Power; then, too, there was the hope of winning, as the result of a successful war or the price of military aid, some of those more or less Italian districts that are under the rule of neighbouring Powers, as, for instance, the Trentino, which still belongs to Austria, and Savoy and Nice, which were handed over to France as payment for services rendered to Piedmont in 1859; and, again, fear of a quarrel with France, a quarrel which M. Gallenga holds must come sooner or later, for all French Catholics, and many Frenchmen who are in no sense Catholic, resent as an act of treachery the seizure of Rome by Italy in France's hour of difficulty and disaster. There is another reason for the growth of the Italian army, a reason which our author leaves out of account. Italy was united by the Piedmontese sword quite as much as by popular agitation and dexterously managed plebiscites. Fighting went on in the South and in Sicily from 1860 to the earlier part of 1865. One of the Neapolitan fortresses held out for King Francis of Naples until 1862. The English press spoke of the civil war in the Neapolitan provinces as the "brigandage," but there were more rebels than brigands in the Abbruzzi, Basilicata, and Sicily. They were mostly brigands in the same sense in which the Vendean insurgents were described as "the brigands" in Republican despatches and orders of the day. In 1863 Mr.

Disraeli in the English House of Commons bore testimony to this when he declared that so far as he could see there was little difference between the rising in Italy and the rising in Poland, although the papers called the insurgents brigands in the one case and patriots in the other. After the brigandage had been suppressed came the war of 1866, then the Garibaldian enterprise of 1867, after which for three years the Italian army was being got ready for a new campaign for the possession of Rome, the expectation in many quarters being that Italy would have either to take the field in full force as the ally of Prussia against France, or to place her armies at the service of Napoleon III., receiving possession of Rome as the price of such effective aid. As a fact, the defeats of France in August, 1870, were so rapid and so decisive that Italy was able to snatch the long-coveted prize without having to pay the price of an alliance with either of the rival Powers. Still the effect was the same—from 1860 to 1870 a considerable portion of the Italian army was always on a war footing or actually engaged in military operations, and there was an unceasing activity in enrolling recruits to fill up the ranks and to form reserves. When Rome was taken Italy found herself by this process in possession of a large army, and since 1870 every Power in Europe has been increasing its armaments. To reduce the force she had already accumulated would have been a confession of weakness for the new State, which was only too anxious to assert her place among the greater nations of the world. So it has come to pass that at least on paper the Italian army stands next after those of France and the three great military empires. To quote Mr. Gallenga's words:—

So far as mere numbers are concerned Italy has now a military establishment based on the census of the population. She is fifth among the "armed nations" of the European Continent. . . . Her army on the war footing can muster a first line of 870,958 combatants, and by the addition of the "movable" and "territorial" militia, the land forces amount to a total of 2,407,344 men. These troops are besides well armed and equipped; they show to advantage on parade; and constitute a well-behaved army, a model of subordination and discipline. The infantry of the line is somewhat undersized, though robust and active. The cavalry is not all well mounted, but the men both in that arm and in the Bersaglieri and Carabinieri are well picked; and the artillery is admirably appointed and served. The officers are, with hardly an exception, well instructed, gentlemanly men, full of zeal and honour, proud of their calling, unremitting in the discharge of their duties.

It is a gallant array no doubt, and looks well on paper. It is the force on which King Victor Emmanuel grounded his hopes that the Italian nation should be "not only respected but also feared." But what is thought of it abroad? A French Prime Minister had the

assurance, in a speech in which he gauged the importance of the Powers of Europe from the strength of their military and naval establishments, to dismiss the Italian army with a cool sneer, describing it as "*une quantité négligeable*." Surely the Italian army deserves "*ni cet excès d'honneur, ni cette indignité*." Whether she be dreaded or not Italy is respected, and her army, though worsted at Custoza, was not at least so utterly disorganized as were the French troops in their short campaign from Saarbruck to Sedan.

Very true; but as Mr. Gallenga himself points out, the Italian army of to-day is an untried force, consisting of men that have never seen fire (if we except the handful of troops at Massowah) and generals that have never led even a brigade against an enemy. The Italian army of to-day is not even equal to the Piedmontese army of 1859 and 1860. The best troops of that little army, La Marimora's famous Bersaglieri regiments, were almost entirely recruited from those very districts of Savoy and Nice which the policy of Cavour handed over to France. The population that furnished the Bersaglieri of those days now gives the best recruits for French regiments of Chasseurs à pied and French mountain batteries, and if Italy and France are destined to fight, Savoy, instead of being the bulwark of Italy, will be in the vanguard of France. There are twelve battalions of Bersaglieri still in the Italian army, but they are not formed of the stuff of 1859; the *corps d'élite* of that army is now formed by the recently raised Alpine battalions (*Cacciatori Alpini*). They are recruited from the best conscripts obtained each year from the mountain districts of Italy. They are kept in garrison at various points at the foot of the Alps and continually exercised on mountain ground. The force numbers about 25,000 men. But it is almost certain that this formation of a second *corps d'élite*, in addition to the Bersaglieri, has reduced to a dangerous extent the average quality of the line battalions which form the bulk of the army, and, after all, have to do the main work of a campaign. The probability is that the Italian army is still very much what it was twenty years ago. If it has gained in some directions it has lost in others. If it ever meets either France or Austria in single combat the inevitable result will be a new Custoza.

To add to the military weakness of Italy, she has not only an enormous coast line, but even her northern mountain frontier is pierced by huge gaps, and is open on either flank to a turning movement on the part of France or Austria. The valley of the Ticino offers an open way for any Power that is bold enough to violate the neutrality of Switzerland. To the west of this point the summits of all the great passes are in French keeping, thanks to the cession of Savoy; while the possession of Nice

gives France an open road along the sea coast, the French frontier being here so traced that all the great natural obstacles to an advance lie well within the French outposts. The eastern half of the Alpine frontier is pierced by the valley of the Adige. "That last wedge of the Southern or Italian Tyrol (the Trentino), where Germany, from the days of Otho I., in the tenth century, established the March of Verona, intending it as her own thoroughfare into Italy over the Brenner, is still as wide open as it was in the Middle Ages. On the very shore of the Lake of Garda, at Riva, and all along the valleys of the Bremba, the Mella, the Piave, &c., Austria keeps the keys of all the gates of Italy on her own side." Finally, there is the open and ill-defined frontier that divides the Venetian provinces from the Austrian districts of Istria and Trieste.

But not only are there all these openings in the northern barrier line, but an Italian army striving to defend it against a French or Austrian attack has always to run the risk of an enemy appearing in its rear, for of all the great nations of Europe Italy has in proportion to its extent by far the longest coast line. For every hundred miles of mountain frontier she has at least four hundred miles of coast.* To defend such a prolonged line by fortresses and garrisons is simply impossible. Hence the necessity of keeping up an enormous naval force as well as a huge army. The naval ports and arsenals of Genoa and Spezzia are strongly fortified, and Rome itself is defended by a circle of outlying forts from a *coup de main*; but for the protection of the coasts against a naval attack, or a diversion made by a military landing in force, reliance is chiefly placed on the huge floating fortresses in the shape of first-class ironclads, in which Italy until very lately surpassed even England. Italy started on her career as a kingdom with a fairly large fleet, composed in the main of the fine Neapolitan steam frigates built by King Ferdinand II. and handed over by the treachery of their officers to Admiral Persano at an early stage of the revolution of the two Sicilies. The bombardment of Ancona was the chief exploit of the new navy. Then, after the famous fight between the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* in Hampton Roads, the world realized that the day of wooden warships was past, and Italy, like all the other States of Europe, set to work to build ironclads. By the summer of 1866 she had an ironclad fleet and was proud of it. It was destined to sweep the Austrians out of the Adriatic, to capture Venice and Trieste. There were splendid broadside frigates like the *Re d'Italia*, and a huge ram, the *Affondatore*, supposed to

* Including Sicily and Sardinia, the Italian kingdom has a coast line of 3,960 miles to defend.

be the most powerful ship in the Mediterranean. At last the day of trial came. The ironclad fleet, with Persano in command, was blockading the island fortress of Lissa, when Tegethoff, with a squadron mainly composed of old wooden frigates, sailed to the rescue. On paper the Italian fleet was so superior to that of Austria that it seemed as if Tegethoff was going to his destruction. But as Farragut, the old American admiral, once said, "One can do without iron in the ships if there is only iron in the men," and Tegethoff inflicted a crushing defeat on Persano's ironclad squadron. The *Re d'Italia*, rammed by the *Kaiser Max*, sank in three minutes with hundreds of men; the *Palestro* was set on fire and blew up with hundreds more; the rest of the fleet retired to Ancona, where the terrible *Affondatore* sank at her moorings. Tegethoff was master of the Adriatic, and Italy had failed by sea as well as by land: both at Custozza and at Lissa an inferior force of Austrians had been victorious over superior numbers and a superior armament.

The fleet, after a few years of hopeless inaction, was remodelled. The old ironclads were broken up or sold, and the Government set to work to provide a fleet of large ironclads, which were to carry heavier guns and armour than those afloat in any other navy. Armstrong's first hundred-ton guns were made for the Italians; it was the building of the *Dandolo* and the *Duilio* that forced France to build the great ironclads of the *Admiral* class, and England such ships as the *Benbow*. Some of the most powerful fighting ships in the world, perhaps the most powerful, are in the navy of Italy.

It cannot be said that her rulers have been remiss in their attention to this part of her duty. The number of her men-of-war of the first, second, and third-class is as yet inferior to that of the five great European Powers—England, France, Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary. But she makes up for such deficiency by her muster of some of the largest and mightiest ironclads of the first-class ever constructed. These are those sea-monsters *Duilio*, *Dandolo*, *Italia*, *Lepanto*, *Lauria*, *Morosini*, *Doria*, now all ready, or in an advanced stage of construction, to which others, *Re Umberto*, *Sicilia*, &c., are added year by year; vessels 103·50 to 122·54 metres in length, and 19·76 to 22·80 in width, of 11,138 to 13,898 displacement tonnage, with 45 to 55 centimetres thickness of armour-plate, with double engines of 7,710 to 18,000 horse-power, and armed with cannon 100 tons weight. Originally intended as floating fortresses for coast defence, but equally fitted for long cruises, some of them running at the rate of eighteen knots an hour, vessels manned by crews of 421 men, and the construction of each of which cost 20,000,000 to 21,000,000, and even 25,000,000 Italian lire—one million sterling! Besides these, there are fourteen second-class, and fifteen third-class vessels, transports, training-ships, torpedo-boats, gunboats, &c. &c., built or building, which will give the

Italian Royal Navy a force of 130 vessels, with 35,000 men and officers, including the men of the Reserve or "Second Contingent."

Thus, like the army, the Italian navy presents a very imposing array—on paper. When next the hour of battle comes, Farragut's question will have to be asked, "Is there iron enough in the men?" If the navy fights as it fought at Custoza, neither weight of guns nor thickness of armour will much avail. The huge "sea-monsters," if they are badly fought and boldly attacked, will be all the more helpless for their size; Italy's four thousand miles of coast will be still open to attack, and though M. Gallenga holds that there is nobody to conspire for the Bourbons now, the foreign invader landing in the South might still be able to raise the country in the name of its old kings, if only because the grievances of thirty years ago are forgotten, and the oppressive results of the existing system are only too keenly felt.

For on the financial and economic side Italy is terribly weak, and this weakness is increased by her exaggerated armaments—armaments at the best of doubtful value, even from the purely technical point of view, but a distinct source of difficulty and danger, when viewed in connection with their economic effects. A large army, a navy of *Duilios* and *Dandolos* costs millions each year, and Italy is not a rich country. "She has balanced her yearly accounts," says M. Gallenga, but it would seem that the balance is not a very stable one. His statistics come down to 1886, but the Budget accounts for 1886-87 stand thus, reduced to pounds sterling:—

Public expenditure . . .	£67,459,410
Public revenue . . .	64,247,107
Deficit . . .	£3,212,303

In point of wealth he compares Italy with France, "that Western rival to which in point of natural resources she bears the closest resemblance," and the result is not very favourable to Italy. Her revenue is about half that of her neighbour's; her imports and exports barely one-fourth; her railways, telegraphs, and highways not quite one-third those of France; manufacturing industry is crippled by the absence of coal, which has to be imported for the railways; in some localities water-power keeps a number of factories going, but the export of manufactured goods is declining, whether it is that production is decreasing or the home consumption increasing. Our author remarks that:—

It is not easy to understand why Italians should not be as good silk-weavers, wine-growers, sugar-boilers, or even at least inn-keepers, as

the natives of foreign lands ; or why, if it is only capital they want, as we so constantly are told, they do not find a way to win it from their more favourably placed neighbours. That the Italians have excellent workmen in their lower classes, and no deficiency of intelligence in the upper ones, cannot be gainsaid, and we have sufficient evidence of their success in every branch of business in foreign countries. Why they should not seem able to work or willing to enrich themselves at home as much as they do abroad, is a phenomenon owing to a variety of circumstances which I shall endeavour to explain in the sequel. For the present I need only insist on the fact that Italy, with all her natural wealth, is by no means as rich a country as France ; indeed, in many respects, not so rich as little Belgium, a country which has not much more than one-tenth of the territory, and somewhat less than one-fifth of the population of Italy, yet whose trade, both import and export, exceeds by several millions that of the whole Italian kingdom.

This is the kingdom, which, starting with a debt incurred in carrying out the "unifying" process, has for twenty-five years vied with the great military Powers in its armaments, and kept up, besides its army of soldiers, a second army of officials, all payed out of the slender national purse. What the result has been M. Gallenga tells in his interesting chapter on Finance. During a quarter of a century, he says, from 1860 to 1885, although the expenditure has increased nearly threefold, "there has been so rapid and extensive a development of national prosperity, that . . . the revenue has for several years been made to keep pace with it." This rather optimistic statement, however, sounds somewhat less satisfactory when we learn at what a cost this increase of revenue has been obtained. It was not accomplished without "a dire strain on the blood and substance of the people, from whom complaints incessantly arose that the burdens they had to bear far exceeded their utmost powers of endurance." In the last few years, thanks to a series of good harvests, the Depretis Ministry were able to abolish the hated grist-tax. But we are told—

There is no immediate expectation of the removal of other taxes almost equally objectionable ; to wit—improvident and vexatious taxes, falling with ruthless severity on the necessities of life, and weighing especially on the lower orders, such as the salt monopoly, the *octroi*, or duty on consumption, at the town gates ; immoral taxes, tending to encourage the gambling propensities of an ignorant multitude, such as the Public Lottery ; exorbitant taxes, absorbing nearly half the income of real property, such as the house-tax, which in some towns (Florence, for instance) amounted to 49 per cent. of the assessed rent, more lately (1884) reduced to 38 per cent. ; finally, unjust and obviously absurd taxes, founded on mere contingencies, such as the legacy duties, equally exacted from an heir on actual and immediate succession, and

also on the reversion of a legacy which may never fall due, or only after an indefinite lapse of years.

Over-taxation has its natural result in cruel suffering amongst the lower classes, especially in the country districts. Lombardy and Emilia, the most fertile districts in Italy, are precisely those where the misery of the people is most strikingly manifest. There it is that the *pellagra* claims its victims by the thousand, a horrible disease that is in a great degree caused by unwholesome and insufficient food. Mr. Gallenga urges that possibly these same miseries existed in the north in former times, that we only hear so much of them now because greater attention is everywhere directed to the condition of the people. But this plea goes for very little when we remember how eagerly every grievance of the populations of Northern Italy was reckoned up in the years before 1859, by the enemies of Austrian rule. Little was heard of the *pellagra* in those days, and the Lombard peasant paid far less taxes, both in money and in personal service, than he pays to-day. No one wants to bring Austria back into Italy, but it is none the less certain that when Austrian generals commanded at Milan and Venice, Lombards and Venetians were far better off than they are now under the rule of King Humbert and the Monte Citorio Parliament.

The condition of the south is no better than that of the north, though there the evil takes a different form.

The Italians of the northern provinces [says Mr. Gallenga] grumbled, it is true, at the burdens on real estate, which have been weighing upon them from the very rise of the new kingdom. But they had it in their power to pay, and they did pay. Not so the southerners, and especially the Neapolitans, a people among whom the French laws on succession, at work for these last three or four generations, had broken up the fortunes of the old feudal families, and parcelled out the country into a large number of petty estates, the owners of which had the utmost difficulty in making both ends meet. The Neapolitans grumbled little, but they paid next to nothing, till the stringent fiscal measures resorted to by the Minister Quintino Sella compelled them. The consequence was that, before the year 1883, as many as 40,000 of the smaller properties were given up by the owners, unable to meet the tax-gatherer's demands—a number, which I was told,* has since risen

* Mr. Gallenga here adds the following note: "I have been unwilling to modify these statements because they rest on data supplied by impartial persons, whose authority had the greatest weight with me. On referring to some of the highest Government officials in Rome, they showed some surprise and were sure that such statements must be greatly exaggerated, and that, at all events, the number of estates seized and sold in payment of arrears of taxes was larger in the island of Sardinia than in the southern provinces. Hitherto, however, no precise statements on the subject have appeared, and it is in itself too grave a matter not to deserve the strictest inquiry."

to 65,000 ; and what is worse, of these estates, abandoned or seized by the Government for the non-payment of taxes, and as such put up for sale by auction, no less than 25,000 have found no purchaser ; a state of things involving, not merely the ruin of the landowners, but also the dispersion of the land-labourers ; for these latter, placed in the alternative of starving or turning brigands, preferred in many instances to leave the country ; and this they are doing now by hundreds and thousands, out of a home-loving population, among whom emigration was hardly ever heard of before.

While the land-tax is the chief burden of the country folk the income-tax presses heavily on the commercial and professional classes. It now stands at 13·80 per 100 lire, which is equivalent to an income-tax of 2s. 8d. in the pound. Moreover, the exemption for small incomes only goes as high as 500 lire (£20) per annum. Yet we in England think our income-tax high at 8d. in the pound, with an exemption for all incomes under £150. Then, beside the State taxes, the unfortunate dweller in cities has the municipal taxes to pay, and these in Italy have a tendency to run very high. The example of the Government has been followed by the municipalities, so far at least as extravagant expenditure is concerned. And the misfortune is that most of this money has been spent on mere showy decoration rather than solid improvement of the cities. Naples is the worst case of all. After the terrible visitation of cholera, in 1884, the Parliament generously and wisely voted a subsidy of a hundred million lire (£4,000,000) to carry out sanitary improvements in the great southern city. Most of this large sum is being wasted on " mere idle embellishment."

The causes of this huge expenditure—which is impoverishing whole districts, and must lead, sooner or later, to national bankruptcy—is, as we have seen, partly the ambitious policy of the actual rulers of Italy, a policy necessitating the keeping up of an army and navy out of all proportion to the needs of the country ; and partly it is the result of the kingdom starting with a debt incurred by Piedmont in furtherance of the revolutionary scheme which came to a head in 1859 and 1860. But this extravagance is also the result of the actual system of government that has been set in operation in Italy since its unity was proclaimed in 1861. Let us hear Mr. Gallenga again, premising only that he seems to generalize too much in supposing that the system he describes is *necessarily* characteristic of democracy. At the same time there is no denying that Italian democracy has taken very kindly to it.

The tendency [he says] of every State, based on democratic principles, is to work out by legal means that spoliation of the wealthy classes for the benefit of the poorer, which every revolution, since

1798,* attempts, but in spite of its unscrupulousness is never able thoroughly to accomplish by violent means. A Government, whether Republican as that of France, or Constitutional as that of Italy, would in our days *scorn to rob* the rich. It simply taxes them; and it employs almost the bulk of the proceeds of the taxes to relieve the wants of those who, unfit for any useful work, yet unable to keep themselves without work, can manage to wriggle themselves into those public offices, or into those Government undertakings, where, if the pay is moderate, it is at all events, in most instances, far more than the work is worth.

Accordingly, every Ministry devotes itself to the work of finding a number of little places for its friends: every session of the Parliament passes laws which create new posts. Works are carried out by the State which might be much better left to private enterprise. Sometimes officials are appointed for the execution of a law which is still in the region of projects, as in 1878, when the Minister of Agriculture, amidst the applause of the House, announced that it would be impossible to bring in a promised law for the preservation of the forests until next session, but that meanwhile, "in order to do something," he would proceed at once to the appointment of forest guards. The civil servants in direct employment of the State form an army of 170,652, without including the 79,795 teachers in the schools; besides these, there are the provincial and municipal officials. Altogether about a million persons draw pay from the State, besides those in its naval and military service. Naturally salaries are low, and the effect of this is felt most grievously in the judicial department. Mr. Gallenga notes how one of his friends, a gentleman deeply acquainted with the subject, told him that

The judges of the Italian courts, from the highest to the lowest, are more wretchedly paid than they were in Lombardy and Venice under Austrian rule; a statement, if correct (as I have no doubt it is), which explains and justifies the complaint one so frequently hears in Northern Italy, that, however proud the people may be of the independence of their country, they have reason to regret the severe but incorruptible administration of "German" justice (*Giustizia Tedesca*).

This is one of the darkest touches in the picture that our author draws of the Italy of to-day. The Austrian is gone, and the people, who are proud of their deliverance from foreign rule, regret the even-handed justice of the alien courts, and are all but ruined by the new rulers who, while they tax them to the utmost limits of forbearance, yet are not able to afford the sums necessary to secure them respectable judges and magistrates.

* Probably a misprint for 1789.

But there is yet another branch of Italian finance to be considered. When Cavour, more than thirty years ago, found Piedmont almost on the verge of bankruptcy, thanks to his own schemes for putting Victor Emmanuel at the head of an Italian kingdom, he attempted in 1855 to fill the exhausted treasury by the robbery of the Church in the old Sardinian kingdom. "The great statesman," says Mr. Gallenga, "conceived that application should be made to the Church for restitution to the people of part of that wealth which had been, so to say, given her in trust by and for the people." Since robbery was first styled "conveyance" by the wise men of the proverb, there has been no such misapplication of words. Cavour took from monks, priests and nuns the little wealth they held for the people, and used for the people, in the service of religion and of the poor, in promoting education, in doing much that is now done in an unloving inefficient way by an army of paid officials; and he used this money in paying placemen, in supporting a host of refugees from other parts of Italy, and in plotting revolution in the Duchies, the Papal States, and the kingdom of Naples. Leaving all higher considerations out of account, one may well ask what warrant had Cavour for such a reckless malversation of trust funds? What would be said of an English Minister who diverted the moneys of the Established Church, the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, and the public schools, to carrying contested elections, and fitting out military expeditions, even though the ultimate objects of his policy were in themselves most excellent? Cavour and his colleagues did something very like this, when in 1855 they got the Sardinian Parliament to vote the law of *Incameramento*, or confiscation of Church property. The proceeds of the operation were to be devoted to bettering the condition of the poorer parish clergy, and promoting education in the State schools. But he would be a bold man who would assert that this ostensibly beneficent scheme was ever carried into effect. The law was extended to each new State or province annexed to the new kingdom from 1860 to 1870. The main object of the law was to get rid of the religious orders of men and women. So far it has only broken up many world-famous monasteries, and inflicted much suffering on individuals. But the Catholicity of Italy was too strong for the schemes of the Government to be fully worked out. The religious orders are there to this day, and their numbers are now decidedly on the increase. Financially, the measure was also a failure. Probably, a number of officials gained something by it. The State has only lost. The small gains it realized were poured out in the huge flood of the national expenditure, and undoubtedly (though Mr. Gallenga would probably not admit it) the breaking-up of many of the monasteries has tended quite as

much to the impoverishment of the neighbouring districts as a similar operation did here in England three centuries ago. The *Incameramento* touched only a portion of the possessions of the bishops and the secular clergy. This in itself we may take as an admission that the wealth of the Church in Italy before the recent revolution was by no means extravagant. The changes at Rome have deprived the Holy See of many resources on which it relied for promoting the work of the Church throughout the world, and this without giving the State much help in its embarrassments.

So far, facts point inexorably to the conclusion that Italy, notwithstanding all her claims to be a great Power, is not a strong Power. Her financial difficulties and the enormous taxation are a standing source of weakness; the army and navy are a doubtful protection at best, and at the same time the cause of much of the financial difficulty: add to this the needy army of underpaid civil servants, and we have a strange picture of national weakness and inefficiency, the outcome of five-and-twenty years of "freedom" and "unity."

"A nation must stand either on its own strength or on its policy," says Mr. Gallenga, truly enough, in a passage quoted at the outset of this article. Let us see if in the absence of "strength" Italy can rely upon her "policy" as a safeguard, and a pledge of permanent national existence. Her only security must consist in keeping out of quarrels, or if she must fight, taking care to have strong allies. But in the very constitution of the Italian kingdom there is cause of quarrel with at least one great neighbouring State, and as if this were not enough the Italian Government has gone out of its way to lay the foundation of future difficulties. Let us hear Mr. Gallenga on the first of these points:—

There seemed, at the outset, no probability of any disturbance arising for Italy on the part of the great States of Central Europe. Both France and Austria, or Germany, had had quite enough of their rivalry for the possession of a land which they had for centuries been watering with their best blood. They had withdrawn from it in good earnest, and no mere love of conquest would now tempt them to venture across the Alpine barrier again. Unfortunately, the reconstruction of Italy, in itself a great event, determined a catastrophe of even greater magnitude—the fall of the Papacy (*sic*); and the Papacy, when all is said, is still more of a power than the Italians imagined; a greater power in opinion of Protestant than of Catholic States; a power to which Gladstone's England secretly truckles, a power which Bismarck's Germany has met more than half-way to Canossa. The dethronement of the Pope-King was the bitterest drop in the cup of humiliation that France had to drain in the issue of her fatal contest with Germany. So long as the Pope is a "prisoner," so long as Italy is one, France cannot be

said to have spoken her last word. Every stick is good to beat a dog; should France at any time have her will—it little matters whether a Thiers or a Gambetta, a Freycinet or a Floquet, or even a priest-eater like Clemenceau or Rochefort, be at the head of the Government—in the absence of any better cause the Pope may still at any time furnish a pretext for a French crusade against Italy. And in any such occurrence Italy would have her enemy's ally within her own boundaries, in the very heart of the country.

Of course when Mr. Gallenga talks of the "downfall of the Papacy," he means the overthrow of the temporal power. It is striking to hear this ardent Italianist so frankly confessing that the very act which completed the unity of Italy is a permanent source of weakness and danger. Italy has to count with the possible, or rather the probable, hostility of France, and though she may guard herself by a German alliance, she has no security that when the hour of danger comes Germany will not be fully employed elsewhere. Nor is the German alliance in itself one to be relied upon with complete confidence. Five years ago Italy, Austria and Germany signed a treaty, by which they mutually guaranteed each other against any loss of territory, and this treaty has just been renewed for five years more. But such engagements count for very little more than the usual profession of perpetual peace and amity to be found in most treaties between nations. Of the eighty-three million subjects of the Austrian and German empires more than forty-one millions are Catholics. Austria-Hungary is a Catholic State, and Bismarck's recent political alliance with the Holy See shows that even a Protestant empire may have motives for adopting a Papal policy. Whether either of the empires of Central Europe would move one single man to protect Italy against a French attack would depend on the circumstances of the moment. Meanwhile, it is undoubtedly Bismarck's policy to encourage a certain amount of ill-will between France and Italy. Anything that can divert French attention from the Rhine and occupy French ambition in distant enterprises is welcome at Berlin. When, after the Berlin Congress of 1878, it was agreed that France should seek "compensations" in Tunis, Bismarck was one of the consenting parties. It gave France abundant occupation for the time, and it was a blow against Italy. There had been for many years a numerous Italian colony at Tunis, and ambitious Italian statesmen had come to think of the country as a future province of their new kingdom, an Italian Algeria, destined to be more prosperous than its French prototype. Already Italian influence was all-powerful at the Court of the Bey. But all these hopes were destined to disappointment. France first invaded, then "protected," and finally annexed Tunis, and now Italians are mutter-

ing useless protests against the proposed construction of French fortresses with a great naval arsenal at Biserta, eighty miles from Sicily, a project in which they naturally see a standing threat to all Southern Italy.

The seizure of Tunis by France had an important effect upon Italian foreign policy. The Government felt the necessity of saving their own credit by finding something to annex elsewhere. Tunis, with its colony of 11,000 Italians, was gone; but why not take part in the general scramble for Africa, and find some other territory on which to hoist the red, white and green tricolor? The first idea was to make a bold stroke for Tripoli. But, alarmed by the fate of Tunis, the Sultan was pouring war-tried Turkish battalions into the country, and there were other considerations which withheld Italy from launching upon so serious an enterprise. Let us hear Mr. Gallenga again:—

The first impulse of the Italians, on seeing themselves forestalled by France in their designs upon Tunis, was to recoup themselves for the downfall of their hopes in that quarter by the annexation of Tripoli. But to say nothing of the comparative worthlessness of that Regency, any step in that direction might have brought on a quarrel with Turkey, involving also, in all probability, the risk of a rupture with France—a rupture which, Italy well knows, cannot ultimately be averted, but which it is her good policy indefinitely to adjourn. For in her colonizing schemes Italy is well aware that it would be idle to put her trust in Bismarck's Germany; in the first place, because Germany herself is on the look-out for colonies, and her Chancellor cannot see what need Italy may have of Transmarine any more than of Transalpine possessions; in the second place, because Bismarck, since the affairs of 1866, and his pamphlet duel with La Marmora, looks upon Italy as a shifty and tricky ally, by no means to be trusted; and in his German antipathy for all that is *Wälsch* he is never sorry for an opportunity of taking a Latin country down a peg, and administering a more or less friendly snub. He would be ready enough to back Italy in any matter in which his own country's interest might be in the least concerned; but in any attempt at aggrandisement he would be sure to leave her to cut open her oyster with her own knife, whatever consequences the operation might have for her fingers. Neither Germany nor France wish Italy to be greater than they have both helped to make her.

In their perplexity and disappointment Italian statesmen turned their eyes to another quarter, where before long they had some hope that an English alliance might do something for them. As early as 1869 an Italian firm—the Rubattino Steam Navigation Company—had, in anticipation of the opening of the Suez Canal, bought a quantity of land on the shores of Assab Bay, in the Red Sea, and established a coaling station there, the natives, a

Danakil tribe, accepting a very small sum as purchase-money for a considerable tract of low-lying sun-scorched country, watered by two springs of brackish, hardly drinkable water. Two islands off the coast were included in the purchase. In January 1881 the property, such as it was, was transferred to the Italian Government, then anxiously on the look-out for some territory in Africa. Italy's first foreign province consisted of about sixty square miles of ground, with a fluctuating population, never exceeding a thousand souls. Then began the English adventures in Egypt, and Mr. Gallenga states that before Tel-el-Kebir was fought and won an English alliance was offered to Italy:—

The Gladstone Government, after a vain application for the joint action of France and Turkey, turned to Italy, tendering to her an opportunity for the gratification of that ambition for which the whole world gave her too much credit. They reminded the Italian Government how the little kingdom of Piedmont, by her participation in the Crimean War, had placed herself at the head of Italy, suggesting that by lending a hand to England at the present juncture the kingdom of Italy would henceforth associate its destinies with those of the British Empire.

The Depretis Government hesitated until the English were at Cairo and their help was no longer needed. The opportunity, however, came again, and this time the Government acted prematurely. The Nile Expedition had failed, and a second English army was landed on the Red Sea coast, to smash Osman Digma and lay a railway up to Berber. Whether invited by England or not—a point on which questions in both the English and the Italian Parliaments failed to elicit any clear reply—the Italians suddenly became active on the Red Sea coast. They landed troops at various points near Assab Bay, and suddenly seized Massowah.* Italy soon had 10,000 picked men on the coast.

It was very naturally surmised [says Mr. Gallenga] that the object of their movement was to act in concert with the English . . . the plan being that while the English came up from Suakim upon Berber, their auxiliaries should march from Massowah to Kassala, when the allies might join their forces at Berber. But as the English gave up all their schemes of rescuing, avenging, or smashing anybody, and were even upon the eve of withdrawing from Suakim, it was supposed that the duty of holding that place would devolve upon the Italians, who should bring up their forces from Massowah, with all the required reinforcements from home. And as the English, pressed by their diffi-

* Mr. Gallenga calls it "the old Abyssinian sea-port of Massowah;" it has been for centuries a Turkish, and later an Egyptian, port. The grievance of the Abyssinians was that after they had been trying to get it for years, and were just hoping to secure it as the reward for their march to Kassala, the Italian flag was hoisted there beside the Egyptian.

culties with Russia in Afghanistan, were rapidly embarking their forces, the chances were that Italy might be left alone in the field in a country where, independently of the terrible heat and unhealthiness of the climate, they would find themselves exposed to the hostilities both of the Soudanese and Abyssinians, as well as to the remonstrances, protests, and even threats, of Turkey and France, all bent on driving them from their position at Massowah.

This is very nearly what has happened. Instead of being the first step to an English alliance, the Massowah adventure has led to nothing. Writing before General Gene's disastrous conflict with Ras Alula, Mr. Gallenga notes that so far the Italians had had "no other enemy to contend with than a murderous climate." Since this was written the Italians have suffered at least one defeat at the hands of a barbarian enemy, and one detachment of Gene's Bersaglieri has been simply annihilated. Neither profit nor credit has come from the occupation of Massowah. It has led to disastrous warfare with Abyssinia, a diplomatic quarrel with Turkey, and a further tension of the already strained relations of Italy and France, which views with jealousy the occupation of a town in which her agents had long been at work, and a region where she had already planted her own outposts.

It would seem, then, that the policy of Italy affords her no better security for the future than her armed force. She has gone out in search of adventures, and laid a very secure foundation for future quarrels with more than one of her neighbours, and the main difficulty of her position, the Roman question, is as unsolved as ever. Mr. Gallenga says bitter things of the Pope, because he will not come to terms with the new rulers of Italy. He speaks as if all would be well if Leo XIII. would only consent to be the first subject of King Humbert. To listen to him one would imagine that all the grievances were on the side of the State, that not it but the Church had been throughout the aggressor. He seems to forget that the Italian Government has openly and flagrantly broken the very law of guarantees which it offered to the Pope as a basis of agreement; that even if the original flaw in its title to Rome and the Pontifical States could be made good, its conduct in Rome, above all its dealings with the Propaganda, are enough to make the situation "intolerable," to use the very words of the Holy Father. We are not going to discuss the Roman question here at the end of a lengthy examination of other topics, but this much must be said—the great misfortune of Italy has been that the party which accomplished her unity was a party in the main hostile to religion, and quite as eager to humble the Chief of Christendom and to break up the monasteries, as to unite north and south, and drive the foreigner beyond the Alps. The party of Garibaldi and Mazzini was determined that, if possible,

united Italy should not be Catholic; the party of Cavour, which these others were forced to follow, was equally determined that the only unity allowed to Italy should be a unity under the headship of Piedmont. There was no real reason, there is no reason still, why Rome, the Rome of the Popes, should not be at once the centre of Christendom and the capital of a united Italy. But this is only because unity does not necessarily imply the present state of things. There is a federal union as well as the union under a single crown and a single legislature, and federal union is possible with more than one prince as well as more than one legislature. German unity exists as well as Italian unity, and yet there are more than one crowned king in Germany. Now, in 1859 and 1860 everything was shaping itself in Italy for a federal union, which would have left a local independence to each of the States, while combining their forces for common defence. A large number of questions would have been referred to a legislature chosen by all Italy, and meeting in Rome, or some other of the great cities, to deal with the common interests of the whole country. The House of Savoy would have held a proud position, for its head would have been the most powerful prince in Italy, and its dominions would have extended through all the north. Under such a system Italy would have been spared the sacrilegious attack on Rome, the rupture with the Papacy, the five years of mutual slaughter in the South, the disgrace of Custoza and Lissa, the enormous debt, and the crushing taxation of to-day. But Cavour and his fellow-conspirators would not have it so. The treacherous attack on the South, and the announcement of a speedy invasion of the Papal States, put an end to the project of an Italian confederation just as it was ripening into reality. It was agreed by the makers of Italy that she should come into existence in open hostility to the Church. It seems as if, even if there had been no Roman question, this character would have been impressed upon the movement; for years before a blow was struck at Rome the war with the Church began by the attack on Church property in the old Sardinian kingdom. We have seen how one result of this policy has been to make the Italy of to-day anything but a strong and prosperous State, while the vice of her origin clouds her future, and imperils her continued existence among the nations. The attack upon religion has reacted upon the people themselves. If the results are not worse than they are it is because there is still in Italy an active Catholic body sufficiently in earnest and sufficiently well organized to control the local elections, and secure that at least the youth of their town or province shall be brought up in Christian schools. But for all that there are sad signs of growing demoralization.

Mr. Gallenga is no pessimist, but he has to write passages like this in his survey of the Italy of to-day :—

The real truth is, perhaps, that “there is something rotten in the State” of Italy. It may well be pedantry to remind the Italians that the real worth of a nation is but the sum of all its private and domestic virtues; that a people deaf to the sense of duty is hardly entitled to exercise any right; that a people who never learned to obey has done nothing to fit herself for command. Who knows it not? These are truisms easily established in theory; but how many are there to carry them out into practice? Since 1859 the population has largely increased in Italy; more work is done, more wealth has been accumulated. But can we feel sure that this increase of material well-being in some classes is attended by a corresponding improvement of the conditions of all the other classes? Must it not, on the contrary, be evident that the lower instincts—luxury, avarice, envy, and other deadly sins—have been all these years gaining the upper hand? Does it not too frequently happen that where you are looking for the country, you only find the town or province, the district or parish; that where you appeal to patriotism you are only answered by egoism?

Let us quote what he says a little further on, merely premising that our author holds that Italy has been, to use his own expression, “too Frenchified,” and that the institutions of the new kingdom are too democratic for the country, an opinion for holding which the “clericals” have often been denounced as bad citizens.

To this condition [he says] Italy has been brought by five lustres of French democracy, by the maxim that “one man is as good as another, and even perhaps a deal better;” by the notion that a free citizen has a right to *all* liberties, even to that of doing wrong; that laws are only made to be broken; and that in a free State, whoever may be appointed to command, no one is bound to obey. In little more than five lustres Italy has brought herself to the condition of “*La France Acéphale*” (headless France). There is hardly a class, hardly a party, hardly a *clique*, large or small, hardly an individual, in a position to preside over the country’s destinies. There is, it is true, a king—the best of kings; but, then, modern democracy will only tolerate a king who “reigns and rules not.” Italy has reached only half the goal aimed at by Mazzini when he wished to enthrone “*Dio e il Popolo*” (God and the people). The people is sovereign, but God is nowhere. What have the Democrats done with Him? They have broken the laws, the earthly ties of man to man, and they have trampled on religion—*i.e.*, on conscience, which is the Divine link by which alone human bonds can be securely riveted. “Away with the Pope! Down with the Priest! Up with Godless schools in a Godless State!” Such is the Democratic clamour in Italy; in that benighted country where nine-tenths of the living population can no more exist without their *Santa Messa* (Holy Mass) than without their daily

bread; and the other tenth consists of arrant infidels, who dare not die without crying, not God! God! but "*Un prete! Un prete!* For God's sake send for a priest!"

No wonder that Mr. Gallenga does not end his book in a very hopeful spirit. A tone of disappointment runs through it, and his last words tell more of perplexity and hoping against hope than anything else. This much is clear to him, that things cannot go on as they are going; that Italy is not safe in the hands of the men who have been ruling, or attempting to rule, her for the last "five lustres," the last twenty-five years. But he does not seem to realize the full force of this admission. For more than twenty-five years the Catholic party in Italy, obedient to the voice of Pius IX. and Leo XIII., has systematically abstained from taking part in national or State politics. Of late years they have organized themselves successfully to control the elections of the local bodies, chiefly with a view to saving the schools from the anti-Catholic propaganda of the Government. But so far as concerned the elections to the Parliament, the formation of Ministries, and the control of the policy of the country in home and foreign affairs, the Liberals have had a perfectly free hand. They have quarrelled among themselves, but no clerical has opposed them. The result is that a veteran of their party, one who was risking his life for what he believed to be the cause of Italy, years before most of them were born, can only speak of their work in the language of despair. Was there ever such a condemnation of a political party out of the mouth of one of its own prophets?

Probably there is much more that is good in Italy at the present moment than Mr. Gallenga is at all inclined to believe, and this because he shuts his eyes to all the good that is to be found in the ranks of those who for him are merely Clericals, Reactionaries, Obscurantists. Old prejudices blind him, and he speaks unjustly and harshly of men in whom lies the best hope of Italy. If he knew the Catholics of Italy better, if he would pay some attention to the part they have played in local politics in the last ten years, he would not speak so despondently of the future. The power of the Catholic party in Italy is a growing one. Year by year religious instruction is restored to schools from which it had been banished; year by year new provinces and communes elect Catholic councils. Sooner or later a new crisis will arise in the affairs of Italy; then will come the time for the Catholic party, organized in these local contests, to assert its power in a wider field. When that hour does come, it will be the work of the Catholic party to drive from power the promoters of lawlessness and irreligion, and to repair as far as possible the evil that has been done in Italy in the last quarter of a century.

If leaders are found equal to the occasion to do this work in a bold patriotic spirit, with the wisdom to secure the full freedom of the Holy See, in a reconstructed Italy, while still ensuring for their country a place among the nations, such a change will be the beginning of a brighter time. Everything points to some form of Federalism as the probable solvent of the many difficulties of the Italian question; but before the solution is accomplished it may perhaps be the destiny of Rome and of Italy to pass through darker days than they have yet seen.

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE.

ART. VIII.—LIGHTFOOT'S ST. IGNATIUS AND THE
ROMAN PRIMACY.

The Apostolic Fathers. Part II.: "St. Ignatius;" "St. Polycarp." By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Durham. Two Volumes. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

THE least observant student must be forcibly struck, in passing from the New Testament to the works of the Apostolic Fathers, with the contrast between the inspired and the uninspired writings. Even if we try to consider both from their merely human side, the difference in clearness of expression and literary power is so enormous, that it is impossible to believe it undesigned by Providence. The pathetic simplicity of the Gospels, and the eloquent pen of St. Paul, were indeed divine instruments of great power in the conversion of the world. But, to show that God had chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, the Apostles were succeeded by at least two generations, more profoundly indifferent to literary fame than any that have come after them. The husbandmen were so few, and the harvest so great, that they had no leisure to write, and would have made St. Cyprian's words their own: "Non magna loquimur, sed vivimus." Moreover, as one of their number has told us, they were happy in hearing those speak who had been taught by the Divine Master himself by the Sea of Galilee or in the Holy City, and rightly thought that "the knowledge gained from books could not be of such service as that which flowed from the living and enduring voice." Yet, however natural their silence, and however providential as estab-

lishing the divine origin of Christianity, it is none the less a serious loss to their heirs. And, even of the scanty literature of those times that has come down to us, so much is anonymous, of doubtful authenticity, or clearly supposititious, that all the known writings of the immediate successors of the Apostles could be readily contained in one small volume. It will be seen at once how this scantiness makes it difficult and unsafe to appeal to their testimony. Above all, it encourages the "fallacy of silence"—the assumption that whatever is not mentioned in these works was then not believed, or non-existent. This opinion is patent as soon as pointed out, and is recognized by all; but it is so tempting to all who are concerned in denying the Apostolic origin of Catholic doctrine and practices, that it is worth while to give a popular illustration; others will occur in the course of this article. Protestants and Catholics alike know that our three great English Cardinals have been constant defenders of the faith, and that there is perhaps no Catholic teaching which could not be found in their pages. Yet it would be very easy to extract at random fragments from their works which would make a volume larger than the "*Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*," and yet leave whole provinces of Catholic dogma and discipline unmentioned. The result is, that the first ages of Christianity are a debateable area, and as it were a hunting-ground, in which each one finds what he has gone to seek. To the Anglican they reflect the ideal of the Church of England as he understands it; to the Presbyterian, a congregational system; while to French and German Rationalists it is the home of figments, strange and monstrous as those which people the outer regions of mediæval charts and travels. We may be glad these last admit that, when the darkness lifts, and Origen, Tertullian and Cyprian give us light enough to recognize Christianity, it already has the distinctive features of the Catholic Church. Harnack, to whose works we shall have repeated occasion to refer, for instance, says:—

Renan has clearly seen that the history of dogma has only two periods, and that the alterations which Christianity has lived through since the formation of the Catholic Church bear no appreciable ratio to the changes which it experienced before that Church was established. He only puts the date of that establishment too early in the following passage: "Si nous comparons le Christianisme, tel qu'il existait vers l'an 180, au Christianisme du IV^me et V^me siècles, au Christianisme du moyen âge, au Christianisme de nos jours, nous trouvons qu'en réalité il s'est augmenté de très peu de chose dans les siècles qui ont suivis."

The admission is important enough—indeed, in any other department of history it would probably suffice to command

general assent. But it only limits the province of the Catholic apologist, and directs his attention to the ecclesiastical history of the first two centuries as the central position in the battle-field. Happily, we can recognize most fully the learning, diligence, and desire for perfect fairness of all our chief opponents, even where, alas! they are led furthest astray by some antecedent fallacy, or some misconception of the very nature of revealed truth.

Among such honoured opponents Dr. Lightfoot has long held one of the highest places. His commentaries on several of St. Paul's Epistles, and his answer to the author of "Supernatural Religion," are well known to all students. He has also published a critical edition of St. Clement of Rome. In the present work he gives us the result of many years' study, all the more valuable because he has modified the opinions with which he started. If, as we have heard, it has delayed the publication of his commentary on the Ephesians, our gain is not unmixed, though this latter volume, we hope, may now soon be accessible to us. A great part of his present work was written before the end of 1878. He was then appointed to the bishopric of Durham, and his leisure has been too scanty to allow of rapid progress. Every student will sympathize with his regret that "for weeks, and sometimes for months together, I have not found time to write a single line;" all do not know at the cost of how great self-denial his work has been at last accomplished. It has no doubt gained by the opportunities of reconsideration and revision which this delay has given, though we doubt whether the general arrangement has not suffered from such constant interruption. A very competent judge has said that it "is the most learned and careful patristic monograph which has appeared in the present century;" and all will agree that it exhausts its subject, and scarcely allows of the possibility of a future editor. Catholics in particular owe him a debt of gratitude for so abundantly vindicating a Father, whose letters, as we shall presently show, are one of their most precious inheritances. Independently of their matter, the history of St. Ignatius' Epistles is of sufficient general interest to call for a short account of them.

When literature first began to dawn in the Middle Ages, seventeen epistles, attributed to St. Ignatius, were in circulation in Western Europe. Four of these, purporting to be a correspondence between our saint and the Blessed Virgin and St. John, were soon recognized to be clumsy forgeries. Dr. Lightfoot is careful to clear St. Bernard of the charge of having thought them genuine. The remaining thirteen were at first naturally accepted, but by degrees it was discovered that Eusebius knew only seven letters; that the quotations in that author and Theodoret diverged greatly from the text, and that many of the

references to early Christian history were gross anachronisms and blunders. At the time of the Reformation another influence came into play; the support given by the Epistles, as then known, to the supremacy of the Holy See and to episcopacy, led writers to support or deny them, according to their theological doctrines. Catholics generally (with the notable exception of Petarius) accepted them; Protestants did not deny a nucleus, but excised whatever did not suit their several views. The way in which the shorter text was next discovered is peculiarly interesting to the English reader. Ussher, the learned Protestant Archbishop of Armagh, observed that the quotations from St. Ignatius in three English writers (Robert Grossteste, the Bishop of Lincoln, and two Franciscans, John Tyssington and William Wodeforde), while agreeing exactly with the quotations in Eusebius and Theodoret, differed considerably from the "Long Recension" hitherto known. He therefore looked for a more correct text in the English libraries; and his search was rewarded by the discovery of two Latin MSS., which he published in 1644. The original Greek was published two years later by Isaac Voss, except the Epistle to the Romans, which was first brought out by Ruinart in 1689. The discovery of the Vossian text brought no relief to the Presbyterian divines, who had always admitted a genuine nucleus, but excised all the passages testifying to episcopacy. The most learned of these objectors (Daillé) was answered by Pearson, as it was generally agreed finally, and the controversy slept for near two hundred years. But in 1845 Cureton published a Syriac version, which contained only three epistles and a fragment of a fourth, all in a shorter form than the Vossian recension. He contended that he had now discovered the primitive text, of which the Vossian letters were an expansion; and he was at once answered by his brother canon of Westminster, Wordsworth, who characteristically asserted that the Syriac was "a miserable epitome made by an Eutychian heretic." At first the current of opinion turned in favour of Cureton's view, the Catholic critics, Hefele and Denzinger, being in a minority in opposing it; but it has gradually come to be seen that there existed an early Syriac version of the whole thirteen letters (both Vossian and spurious), and that the quotations in early writers are from the Vossian recension; and it is now generally admitted that Cureton's text is merely an abbreviation. Hefele, Alzog, and others considered it was drawn up with an ascetical aim by some Syrian monk; Lightfoot is more probably correct in supposing the selections made due to no fixed principle, but to be mainly accidental. It is not so easy to know who composed the additional letters and interpolations of the "Long Recension," and with what object. But a number of

circumstances converge in pointing to the middle of the fourth century as their date, Cardinal Newman's critical sagacity having anticipated the results of later inquiry. He considers the writer to have been an Arian, an opinion which Lightfoot endorses so far as to suppose his policy was intended to reconcile Arianism and Catholicism. Funk, the latest Catholic editor, argues (not we think quite satisfactorily) that he was an Apollinarian. The forger must have been greatly indebted to the "Apostolic Constitutions," if he was not indeed the author or editor of that work, as Ussher and Harnack suppose.

We may, then, take it for granted that the Vossian recension is the original form of the Ignatian letters; and the next question is, have we sufficient proof of their authenticity? The chief evidence is the epistle of St. Polycarp to the Philippians, which refers to them by name, and this is in turn vouched for by St. Irenæus, and further identified by Eusebius and other witnesses. This is so adequate, that Prof. Harnack, whose competence is undoubted, and whose religious system makes it inconvenient for him to receive the letters, admits it to be "testimony as strong to the genuineness of the epistles as any that can be conceived of."* We need not, therefore, weary our readers with an analysis of the mass of corroborative proof which Bishop Lightfoot's great learning has enabled him to collect, though cumulatively it is strong confirmation. He also shows that the circumstances of his condemnation, his journey to Rome, and death, are not difficulties (as has often been objected), but support the genuineness of his account. A prisoner of no public importance, but merely one of the many provincial convicts sent to Rome for the wild-beast shows, would be contemptuously allowed just such freedom of intercourse with those who chose to bribe his guards, as the saint was. Lucian's account of Peregrinus would prove this, even if he did not intend a caricature of St. Ignatius, as Lightfoot, with Baur and Renan, suppose.

Our saint's appeal to the Romans, not to prevent his martyrdom, is a strong argument for the genuineness, and even for the date, of his epistles. In the early part of Trajan's reign there were Christians enough in high place in Rome to have obtained his pardon; twenty years earlier, or twenty years later, such could not have been found. We cannot enter upon the other reasons which induce Dr. Lightfoot to follow Eusebius and St. Jerome in assigning the martyrdom to some time in the reign of Trajan (100-118). Harnack argues for a date later than 130, but without any external probability that we can discover, merely because of the difficulties he finds in reconciling the earlier time

* *The Expositor*, sec. 3, vol. iii. p. 11.

with his own theories of doctrine and Church discipline. With this exception, no serious attempt has been made, we believe, to shake Dr. Lightfoot's conclusions ; * so that we may safely proceed to treat these letters as the writings of a saint, and a bishop, on his way to martyrdom, in the first quarter of the second century. Their personal interest is unique, and, if we may say so, dramatic. We are not gradually prepared for the beautiful character they reveal to us, nor privileged to witness his advance in holiness, until he was at length worthy of his crown. We have reason to believe that he had been a heathen in early life, but had "found mercy," and at his baptism had taken the name "Theophoros," to keep constantly before his mind his union with God. As to the rest, he comes before us, like Melchisedec, out of the darkness "into the darkness," for one moment only in the light of day. Yet so vivid and distinct are the features of his personality, as revealed to us, in the few weeks of his journey from Antioch to his end in Rome, that we have a less intimate knowledge of many saints whose whole life has been before the world. His desire for martyrdom appealed most strongly, of course, to the Church of the times of persecution. The pathetic letter to the Romans, in which he pleads not to be deprived of his crown, became (as Bishop Lightfoot says) "a sort of martyr's manual." Its influence can be traced in all the earliest authentic records of martyrdom, and it must have helped unnumbered souls to endure even fiercer torments. One sentence above all, "I am the wheat of God, and am ground by the teeth of beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ," has had an attraction for the faithful in every age, such as no other uninspired language possesses. It is quoted by the earliest Fathers ; is handed down to us as his characteristic sentence, in his life in the Divine Office ; above all, is chosen, with an exquisite sense of fitness, for the "Communion" in the Mass of his feast.† Many other phrases, less commonly known, burn with as intense a desire for suffering and death. To quote only a few : "My birth-pangs are at hand ; pardon me, brethren ; do not hinder me from living. Pardon me ; what is expedient for me I know ; now I begin to be a

* We say this, although we have received for review "The Ignatian Epistles entirely Spurious," by Dr. Killen, Principal of the Presbyterian Faculty in Ireland. His language is flippant and often discourteous to one whose services in interpreting St. Paul's Epistles should have commanded his respect ; his competence may be gauged by his ascribing the Ignatian letters to St. Callistus ; and the weakness of his case is shown by the number of gratuitous hypotheses which he has to substitute for Dr. Lightfoot's supported conclusions.

† We do not remark that Dr. Lightfoot notices anywhere the very beautiful Mass for St. Ignatius' Day in the Roman Missal ; and therefore fear he has not the pleasure of being acquainted with it.

disciple." And, even more touchingly in another epistle (Smyrn. iv. 2): "Near the sword, near unto God; surrounded by beasts, surrounded by God." At the same time there is the humble fear: "I love indeed to suffer, but know not if I be worthy" (Trall. iv. 2). "Being in bonds for Christ's sake I fear the more, as yet imperfect; but your prayer unto God shall perfect me, that I may obtain the lot which hath been granted me in mercy" (Philad. v. 1). His earnest desire for death is but the most striking instance of that ardent love for his incarnate Lord which is the motive of every word and act. And it is especially interesting for us to remark, how that love takes the form most familiar to the modern Church, and pours forth its worship and devotion before every detail of the Sacred Humanity. We can conceive no saint of later times uniting himself more heartily with the devotion to the Sacred Heart, to the Precious Blood, to the Five Wounds of our Lord, which are counted a reproach to Catholics to day, than this disciple of the Apostles. The same is no doubt true of the saints of every time. Even the stately language of St. Clement seems to bend, when he bids the Corinthians "look intently on the blood of Christ, and see how precious unto God His Father is His blood, which hath been shed for our salvation, and brought the grace of repentance to the whole world. . . . For the love He bore us, the Lord Jesus Christ gave His blood for us, His flesh for our flesh, His soul for our soul" (vii. 4; xlix. 6). But the works of all the earlier writers were written under circumstances, of various kinds, which checked the spontaneous expression of their piety. In St. Ignatius' letters alone we seem privileged to hear the outpourings of a soul before that mystery of divine condescension, which was the sun and centre of the Catholic spiritual life, then as now.

The word "passion" was ever on his lips. In Christ's passion is involved the peace of one Church, and the joy of another. Unto His passion the penitent sinner must return; from His passion the false heretic dissents; into His passion all men must die; His passion the saint himself strives to imitate; the blood of His passion purifies the water of baptism; the tree of the passion is the stock from which the Church has sprung; the passion is a special feature which distinguishes the Gospel.*

The body and blood of our Lord are the source of his most moving appeals, and are used to signify the essential elements of the life of grace. "Regenerate yourselves in faith, which is the flesh of the Lord, and in charity, which is the blood of Jesus Christ." "I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of

* Lightfoot: note on Ephes. Inscr.

Christ, who is of David's seed ; and I desire for drink His blood, which is charity incorruptible." He does not even hesitate to speak of "the blood of God," and "the passion of God," thus using language which, in the case of the Sacred Heart, has been made a reproach to Catholics by some who have not realized the doctrine of the Incarnation, nor the testimony of Scripture and antiquity. We have seen, in the last sentence quoted, the Holy Eucharist is the form in which his thoughts of our Lord's incarnate body and blood naturally flow. But his assertion of the Real Presence is not to be gathered only from such indirect evidence. He has supplied the Church with one of her most beautiful thoughts, when he urges the Ephesians to continue in the breaking of that "one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote against dying."* Again, speaking of the Docetæ, he says : "These abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father by His mercy raised again." Here Dr. Lightfoot appears to us to have somewhat missed the point. St. Ignatius is not employing the Blessed Sacrament as an argument for the reality of our Lord's natural body, though of course it might be so used : he is rather pointing out the practical results of the heresy which denied that reality. But, either way, the sentence would be devoid of all meaning, unless written by one who believed in the Real Presence, and assumed his hearers' belief also.† In the one case, mere bread and wine would correspond more closely to an apparent than to a real body ; in the other case, there could be no reason why the Docetæ should not join in receiving it. This is strengthened by his presently adding the necessity of priestly consecration, for the valid celebration of the Holy Eucharist. "Let that Eucharist be considered valid (βεβαία) which is celebrated under the bishop, or by one to whom he hath committed it." The whole spiritual life is summed up in "having Jesus Christ in you ;" in being *χριστοφόροι* : faith is the flesh of Christ, charity His blood. The most distinctively Christian virtue is put upon its true foundation, in the sentence : "If any one is able to remain in virgin purity, to the honour of the Lord's flesh, let him remain also in humility ;" which implies that a life of chastity was highly esteemed, and was already the

* Jacobson compares the "immortalitatis alimonia," of the Post-Communion of the twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost.

† This is pressed by Möhler and Freppel. It will hardly be believed that an Anglican divine, Wotton (if Jacobson's note is to be trusted) considered that the last clause of the sentence we have quoted was a denial of the Real Presence, and affirmed merely an action of grace upon the soul of the recipient.

subject of a vow. In another sentence, of acknowledged difficulty, St. Ignatius seems to recognize some, widows in outward condition, but virgins in the sight of God.

To a mind thus penetrated with the reality and the results of the Incarnation, the prevailing heresy of that day must have been peculiarly hateful. The only trace that Docetism has left behind it, is in the decisive testimony of St. Ignatius to the identity of doctrine and devotion in the primitive and the modern Church. The test to which he appeals is characteristic of that early age, and very instructive for our own. The tradition of the Apostolic Churches is not set forth to discriminate truth from falsehood, as in the time of St. Irenæus, nor is Scripture quoted, as in later writers; but the living voice of the Church in its pastors is a sufficient rule of faith. St. Ignatius is, above all others, the great Doctor of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; he asserts constantly and urgently, with every variety of argument and metaphor, the claims of the episcopacy to the obedience of the faithful. The bishop presides in the place of God, the presbyters in the place of the council of Apostles, and the deacons are entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ.

I cried out with a loud voice, with the voice of God, unto them to whom I spake; attach yourselves to the Bishop and the presbytery and the deacons. . . . He is my witness, for whom I am bound, that I have not learned this from man's flesh: but the Spirit proclaimed this: without the Bishop do nothing. All that are God's and Jesus Christ's, the same are with the Bishops. Whoso seeth the Bishop to be silent, let him fear him the more; for we must every way receive him, whom the master of the house sendeth to govern his family, as as the sender himself. Clearly, then, we must look upon the Bishop as upon the Lord Himself.

Such are a few examples, taken almost at random, from the passages on the ecclesiastical hierarchy of which all the letters, save one, are full. It is the more interesting and satisfactory to us that Bishop Lightfoot should have edited St. Ignatius, because a learned treatise in one of his other works* implied what we may without offence call a "low" view of the episcopacy, as well as a denial of the sacerdotal character of the priesthood. The latter subject is outside of our present province; and for the same reason we are compelled to put aside the question of the Apostolic succession in the episcopate, hoping to be able to return to both on some future occasion. In that which now more immediately concerns us, we are glad to be in greater agreement than we were with the former work. Dr. Lightfoot now, indeed,

* The "Excursus on the Christian Ministry." and note on Phil. i. 1, in the "Commentary on the Philippians."

complains a meaning has been put upon his language which he did not intend, and we hope therefore we may have misunderstood him. He says that he is in substantial agreement with Cardinal Newman's language * on this very subject; thus appearing to accept the Apostolic origin of the episcopate, and only questioning the time at which it became localized. We are quite prepared to grant that jurisdiction may very possibly—nay, probably—have been surrendered by the Apostles at different periods, according to the respective needs of the places where they consecrated bishops. But we cannot admit the argument from confusing order and jurisdiction, a fallacy which runs through the present remarks on the episcopate, as well as the "Essay on the Christian Ministry;" and we will therefore very briefly state our reasons for not being convinced by his arguments. Dr. Lightfoot's admissions are these:—1. The episcopate was clearly established in Jerusalem; and this is all the more remarkable, if St. James was not an Apostle. 2. The Pastoral Epistles show that Timothy and Titus exercised episcopal functions in Ephesus and Crete, by the appointment of St. Paul. 3. Episcopacy was firmly and widely established, especially in Asia Minor, early in the second century, and therefore under the influence of St. John. "If the evidence for its extension in the regions east of the Ægean at this epoch be resisted, I am at a loss to understand what single fact relating to the history of the Christian Church during the first half of the second century can be regarded as established." These statements appear to us to concede all that is necessary in the way of historical evidence, to prove the origin of the episcopal order. But each of them is subject to certain qualifications. 1. As to St. James's position in Jerusalem, Dr. Lightfoot remarks that on three occasions the Apostles and the presbyters of that city alone are mentioned. It will be seen that in these three cases (Acts xv. 4, 23; xvi. 4) the matter treated of is not a diocesan one, but concerns the whole Church. This is surely an exception which proves the rule. 2. He considers that SS. Timothy and Titus were not appointed to fixed sees, but were "apostolic delegates," whose position was transitory and whose office was drawing to a close when St. Paul wrote. But of the only passages to which he refers, two (1 Tim. i. 3; Tit. i. 5) merely prove that their jurisdiction was derived from the Apostle; one (1 Tim. iii. 14) that St. Paul himself hoped shortly to visit Timothy; while the other three (2 Tim. iv. 9, 21; Tit. iii. 12) are to recall them "ad limina Apostolorum," for the Apostle's own comfort, and to give an account of their stewardship.

* Note on "The Theology of the Seven Epistles of Ignatius;" in *Essays*, vol. i. p. 251.

3. There is some amount of evidence that episcopacy was le completely established in other parts of the Church than i Asia Minor or Palestine. Much of this evidence is purely nega tive, due to our very scanty knowledge of early Church histor and is merely one of the "fallacies of silence" to which w referred above. The positive indications are very slight indee Rome we shall deal with presently in connection with th primacy. St. Clement's letter to the Corinthians make mention of no bishop; but the circumstances under which i was written imply that the see (as we should now say) wa vacant. His language with regard to Apollo—"a man approve by the Apostles"—*—taken in connection with 1 Cor. iii. 22, ca leave little doubt that Apollo exercised episcopal jurisdiction there and Dr. Lightfoot himself remarks that fifty years later Primu was Bishop of Corinth, and had been preceded by several other In Philippi, St. Paul salutes only the "bishops and deacons; St. Polycarp only the "presbyters and deacons." Yet the forme commends to his "true yoke-fellow" a duty which at least implic jurisdiction.† And in the time of the latter it is scarcely con ceivable that Philippi should be an exception to the episcopa government around. Zahn suggests that the see was probabl vacant; Rothe,‡ that remonstrance and exhortation, such a St. Polycarp's letter contains, could be suitably conveyed only t his subordinates in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Besides the par ticular answers to objections, there is one general one. Th words ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος were only two out of a larg number of terms used in the New Testament and the Apostoli Fathers for bishops and priests (it is convenient in English t follow Dr. Lightfoot, and use these two words, the "sacerdote primi ordinis et secundi," respectively). Until the time, at least of St. Irenæus, they are only employed in their modern precis sense by St. Ignatius; all other writers rather using them t signify the office than the order of the persons spoken of 'Επίσκοπος is usually applied to those who have cure of souls, o ordinary jurisdiction, πρεσβύτερος being used when no such qual ity is referred to, or when the honour in which they are to be hel is brought specially forward.§ By the time of St. Irenæu ἐπίσκοπος had become so far restricted to bishops, that he wa

* προσεκλήθητε ἀνδρὶ δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ' ἀποστόλοις, cap. 47.

† Phil. iv. 3.

‡ "Anfänge d. Chr. Kirche," p. 410.

§ We are of course aware that various opinions have been curren among theologians concerning the use of these terms. The one state above is the most generally held, is substantially the same as Dr. Ligh foot's, and appears to follow of necessity from the use made by the Counc of Trent of Acts xx. 28.

compelled to paraphrase Acts xx. 17.* We are of course far from denying that this rapid change of language did not correspond to a real change of ecclesiastical conditions. It is very probable, as Petavius and many other theologians have held, that the number of persons having episcopal powers and ordinary jurisdiction was in some places very large. Even St. Ignatius expected the bishop to know all that passed in his community, and to be acquainted with each member of it by name. Our only contention is, that the episcopate was not "formed out of the presbyterate by elevation," as Dr. Lightfoot thinks: the reverse would be a closer expression of the facts. The history of the New Testament and of the first two centuries, as he has summed up the facts, seems to us only explicable on the hypothesis that both these orders were originally instituted separately by the Apostles, the exercise of jurisdiction being long reserved to the episcopal order, and only gradually communicated to priests. Every other view is open to the crushing objection that men, who do not readily submit even to an authority which they know to be divine, could never have been persuaded to accept it as a novelty without a protest, of which there is no trace.

St. Ignatius looked to another test of the living voice of the Church, beyond its expression through its pastors. He most urgently enforces the unity of the Church throughout the whole world. He bids St. Polycarp "have a care for the unity, than which nothing is better." And to others he says: "All that shall repent and turn to the unity of the Church, they too shall be God's." An earnest warning is given against schism, independently of false doctrine: "Be not deceived, my brethren, if any man follow one who makes a schism (σχίζοντι), he doth not inherit the kingdom of God; if any one walk in another doctrine, he consenteth not to the Passion." This Church is of universal extension, for "the bishops who are at the ends of the earth are in the mind of Jesus Christ." The Church universal is therefore distinguished by him from each individual church of which it is made up, and the word "Catholic" is first employed to designate it. "Where the bishop is, there let the multitude be; just as where Christ is, there is the Church Catholic."†

The parallel between the particular churches and the Church universal—the microcosms and the macrocosm—implies a visible head of the whole, as well as of each diocese; and our saint

* The translation of the Vulgate, "majores natu Ecclesiæ," is apparently another example of this.

† Smyrn. viii. 2. This sentence has been urged as an objection to the genuineness of the Epistles. Bishop Lightfoot shows, by parallel passages, that in the sense given above it involves no anachronism.

leaves us in no doubt where that head is to be found. The most celebrated of all his letters is addressed to the Romans; its testimony has often been quoted, not always correctly, and it will be interesting to see how Dr. Lightfoot deals with it. The inscription of the letter is to "the Church that hath found mercy . . . that hath been beloved and *been enlightened* (πεφωτισμένη) by the will of Him who willeth all things, that are according to the love of Jesus Christ." Then follows a sentence of which the meaning has been much debated—ἡ τις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ρωμίων—the main question being whether the verb is to be taken absolutely* or in connection with the words that follow. Catholics have naturally inclined to the former alternative, Protestants to the latter. Dr. Lightfoot takes a middle course; translating, with us—"who hath the presidency in the place of the region of the Romans," but explaining that "the latter words probably describe the limits over which the supremacy or jurisdiction" extends. He rejects the various suggestions which Bunsen, Zahn, Pearson, and others have made, but thinks "ἐν Ρώμῃ would have been more natural to describe merely the locality of a presiding see." This we venture to doubt. The Roman Church is more often described by Eusebius and his authorities as ἡ τῶν Ρωμαίων ἐκ. than in any other manner. The latter part of the sentence has difficulties on any hypothesis, but we fully agree that τόπος is pleonastic (Syriasm), and that the whole means "in the country of the Romans." This is probably simply equivalent to "in Rome," and is merely an attempt to express the size of Rome, just as we use the prepositions "in" and "at" for large and small towns respectively, in such phrases as "to stay in London, to live at York." We are the less disposed to disagree with Dr. Lightfoot here, because he admits that these words assign a primacy of rank to the Church of Rome, which is all we contend for.

We presently come to the still more important phrase, προκαθήμενη τῆς ἀγάπης; and here again Bishop Lightfoot adopts an interpretation approaching more nearly to the Catholic than other Protestant editors have done. He admits that there is a reference to the previous sentence, which he takes it to explain: "the Church of Rome, as it is first in rank, is first also in love." This is akin to the ordinary non-Catholic translation, "pre-eminent in charity;" referring merely to the abundant almsgiving for which the Roman Church was distinguished. We are sorry that so great a scholar has not noticed the grammatical objections—surely worth considering—which Catholics have made to this interpretation. To be pre-eminent *in* any quality, such as

* As in *Magnes* vi. 1, where the same word is used of the presidency of a bishop over his clergy.

charity, would naturally be expressed by ἐν ἀγάπῃ or κατὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, rather than by the genitive. The "genitive of relation," as grammarians say, "follows all verbs signifying authority or pre-eminence" (Donaldson); and is used of the thing governed. This is the only construction admitted in such lexicons as Stephanus, Liddell and Scott, &c., each of which give parallel instances from Plato, Euripides, and many later writers.* Nor is there any difficulty in supplying a suitable meaning for ἀγάπῃ in this place. In four other passages St. Ignatius uses the word, as Pearson and Jacobson themselves allow, for the Church.† It is true that our present editor objects to any such use of ἀγάπῃ as an anachronism; and contends that "charity is intended in each case." No doubt; but its repetition so frequently in formulas of salutation surely suggests very strongly that more is meant, and that ἀγάπῃ was used by our saint in a secondary sense for the union of charity κατ' ἐξοχὴν, the Church. This peculiar use of the word has its parallel in the use of ἡ ὁδός in the Acts.‡ The phrase will thus mean, without any violence to the grammar, "presiding over the Church."

After this, there is no detail of the Epistle to the Romans in which we are at issue with Dr. Lightfoot; for we fully agree that the words, "ye have taught others" (cap. iii. 1), refer only to the example set to other Christians by the endurance of persecution. He makes much of the fact that there is no mention of the Bishop of Rome in the whole epistle, connecting it with a view, on which we shall presently dwell, that the Bishop was of less importance in Rome than in the East. The silence of St. Ignatius is undoubted, and is very remarkable; but there are good reasons for not accepting his editor's reason for it. Bishop Lightfoot admits that Rome was under episcopal government then, and we have seen that St. Ignatius classes "the Bishops at the ends of the earth" with those he has known in Asia Minor. We cannot then doubt that, had he thought the Romans underestimated the episcopal office, he would have remonstrated earnestly with them, as he did with the Magnesians in the same case. Cardinal Newman's explanation is far more probable;

* There is, therefore, no reason for Jacobson's mild sneer at Bishop Hefele's quotation from the Byzantine writers. The former quotes, curiously, a sentence in which Cureton unconsciously paraphrases ἀγάπης by ἐν ἀγάπῃ, thus confirming what we have advanced above.

† ἡ ἀγάπῃ Σμυρναίων καὶ Ἐφεσίων (Trall. xiii. 1), ἡ ἀγ. τῶν ἀδελφῶν (Smyrn. xiii. 1, and Philad. xi. 2); and, most remarkably of all, ἡ ἀγάπῃ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν (Rom. ix. 3).

‡ It may be noted that Professor Harnack concedes the point, by the happy translation which cannot be expressed in English, "die Vorsteherin, sei es nun in dem Liebesbunde, oder bei den Liebeswerke."

"he does not refer to the Bishop, or take him (as it were) under his wing." His ecclesiastical superior was the one Bishop whom he could not thus commend to his readers without impertinence. Instead of exhorting the Romans, as he does the other Churches, he says: "I make no commands to *you*, as though I were Peter and Paul." His object in writing was to entreat the Romans not to prevent his martyrdom; and the power to do so would lie in the hands of the influential laity. To call in their Bishop to control them would be to put him in an utterly false position, if he were what we believe he was; and St. Ignatius' silence is, on our hypothesis, most naturally accounted for.

We remarked just now that Dr. Lightfoot admits a primacy, however qualified, of the Roman Church, while minimizing the authority of its Bishop. It was necessary that he should take some such position, considering recent advances in patristic discovery. We think Cardinal Newman somewhere speculates on what would happen if our modern non-Catholics came suddenly in contact with a saint of the primitive Church, as to which they theorize so readily. Something of the kind has really happened of late years. Up to the year 1575 the only copy known of the letter of St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (contained in the celebrated Alexandrine Codex in the British Museum) had a considerable gap, where one sheet had been lost. Bryennios, the Greek Metropolitan of Nicomedia, then discovered, in a library at Constantinople, a MS. which, besides other valuable matter, contained St. Clement's epistle entire; and, by a singular coincidence, a Syriac translation of the whole was acquired by the University of Cambridge in the next year. These additional passages of this earliest Apostolic Father are so important to Catholics, and yet, we believe, so entirely unnoticed by them in this country, that no apology is needed for bringing them before our readers. Before their discovery, St. Clement's letter was, indeed, a strong argument for the primacy of the Holy See. Let the circumstances in which it was written be carefully remarked. St. John was yet alive, and many disciples of the Apostles must have been still living in Corinth, when a revolt against the constituted ecclesiastical authorities took place. There is no reason to suppose the Corinthians appealed to Rome; but St. Clement wrote in the name of the Roman Church to point out the gravity of the offence, and to call for submission. He begins by explaining the reasons for his delay in noticing this trouble thus:—"By reason of the sudden and repeated calamities which are befalling us, brethren, we consider that we have been somewhat tardy in giving heed to the matters of dispute that have arisen among you, dearly beloved, and to the detestable and unholy sedition . . .

which a few headstrong and self-willed persons have kindled." * This is surely the language of an authority on which there daily pressed anxiety for all the Churches ; and the whole epistle continues in the same tone. The Corinthians are called upon to be "obedient unto the excellent and glorious will" of God, to "fall down before the Master and entreat Him with tears," to "let the flock of Christ be at peace with its duly appointed presbyters." Most urgently of all, they are bid to make intercession for their transgressing brethren, "that they may yield not unto us, but unto the will of God." It would seem difficult to evade the force of this language, or to suppose it could be addressed by one sister-church to another. But a much more explicit claim to authority is made in the recently discovered passages. The Corinthians are warned that, "if certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken by Him (God) through us, let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no slight transgression and danger ; but we shall be guiltless of this sin." And again : "Receive our counsel, and ye shall have no occasion of regret." Finally : "Ye will give us great joy and gladness, if ye render obedience unto the things written by us through the Holy Spirit." †

It is a strong testimony to Dr. Lightfoot's desire to be perfectly fair that, upon the first publication of the lost passages of St. Clement he should have called attention to the "urgent and almost imperious tones which the Romans adopt in addressing their Corinthian brethren during the closing years of the first century." ‡ He describes the letter as "the first step towards Papal aggression," and we need not say that we agree with him—only it is clearly a step that takes us all the way. Leo XIII. has not claimed, and cannot claim, more than is here laid down, in the first Papal document on record, in the assertion "God speaks through us" and "we write by the Holy Ghost." The one difference between the Catholic Church and all religious bodies external to it, is that we affirm, and they deny, the presence of the Holy Ghost, teaching the world through the See of St. Peter ; and St. Clement leaves us in no doubt which side he takes in the controversy. Indeed, as writing during the lifetime of an Apostle, he makes a

* I. 1. We quote throughout Dr. Lightfoot's translation. The calamities were probably the persecution under Domitian, and the revolution which closed that emperor's reign.

† 59, 1 ; 58, 2 ; 63, 2. We do not lay stress upon the claims to "know the *προστάγματα καὶ δικαιώματα τοῦ θεοῦ*," and to possess "the *κανὼν τῆς παραδόσεως* while the sister-churches need instruction." Harnack has rightly urged their importance, but they need developing, and we prefer to keep to what is on the surface.

‡ "St. Clement of Rome," pp. 253 *sqq.*

stronger claim to Divine assistance than would be possible for any later Pope. Dr. Lightfoot raises, however, one objection, which it is due to him that we should consider. He fully admits the primacy of Rome, but urges that it is a primacy, not of the episcopate, but of the Church. "The substitution of the Bishop of Rome for the Church of Rome," he tells us, "is an all-important point. The later Roman theory supposes that the Church of Rome derives all its authority from the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter. History inverts this relation, and shows that, as a matter of fact, the power of the Bishop of Rome was built upon the power of the Church of Rome." The same distinction is urged, more bluntly, by Professor Harnack, who, in his recent work,* after collecting all the ante-Nicene evidences of the primacy of Rome, concludes:—"The two propositions, 'Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum,' and 'Catholic is fundamentally the same as Roman Catholic,' are gross fictions, devised in honour of any of the occupiers of the Roman See; but if transferred to the community of the capital of the world, they contain a truth, of which the non-recognition is equivalent to renouncing any attempt to understand the Catholicizing and unifying of the Church."†

Our chief difficulty with this objection is, that we scarcely see in what its importance consists. Dr. Lightfoot is an Episcopalian and admits that episcopal government is Apostolic in its origin therefore apparently of divine institution. If so, the bishop is appointed by God to govern each diocese; he is the executiv

* "Dogmengeschichte," vol. i. pp. 360 *sqq.*

† In the remarkable excursus ("Katholisch und Römisch") of which this is the last sentence, Harnack accepts the Catholic interpretation of the passages in SS. Clement, Ignatius, and Irenæus bearing on the supremacy of Rome. He also gives such reasons as the following:—

1. The Roman Church alone had a definite baptismal formula, which was proposed as the Apostolic rule of faith as early as 180. It was therefore acknowledged to be alone able to discern with precision true from false doctrine.

2. The New Testament canon is first recognizable in the Roman Church and only later in others. The shape and arrangement of the canon is also Roman.

3. The first list of Bishops is to be traced to Rome, in other communities there is none earlier than the reign of Elagabalus.

4. The idea of Apostolical succession was first employed by the Bishop of Rome. This is all the more remarkable because the "monarchical episcopate" was first consolidated in Asia Minor.

5. The Oriental Churches referred the most important questions as to the organization of the Church for decision to the Roman Bishops.

6. Callixtus' "excesses" were opposed by the three great theologians of his time—Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen—on the very ground that they were unheard-of novelties; yet within a few decennia all other churches had followed in the same direction.

power, and every step taken in the name of the Church must be taken by him. Moreover, as matter of history, the history of the Roman Church is the history of the Roman Pontiffs. Except for the shadowy personality of Hermas, we can recall no Roman Christian of the slightest importance, save the Popes, until we come to Hippolytus. It is quite true that we have no pontifical act of theirs preserved until we come to St. Victor: but the same "fallacy of silence" would prove that many later Pontiffs did not consider themselves infallible. But we have as much incidental proof of their importance as we could reasonably expect. Eusebius had no inducement to magnify the office of the Roman Pontiff, nor did he write with that object. But the extreme care which he took to give the list of Bishops of Rome argues that to his informants—Hegesippus and Irenæus—the matter was one of great importance. The former speaks of drawing up a list (*διαδοχὴν ἐποιήσαμην*) of their succession as being one of his principal objects in Rome; the latter ends his catalogue of the Popes down to St. Eleutherius by adding: "By the same order and succession both the tradition from the Apostles in the Church and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us." *

So, too, the Church of Lyons, being desirous of the peace of the Church, wrote in defence of the Montanists, to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia, where these most abounded; "but above all (*οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ*) to Eleutherius, the then Bishop of Rome." Dr. Lightfoot quotes St. Polycarp's visit to Rome in the time of St. Anicetus, and their conference as to various unimportant matters, as well as the observance of Easter. On this Harnack remarks: "Anicetus did not go to the aged Polycarp, but he to Anicetus." We need not refer to any cases later than St. Victor, because he is admitted to have been "a bishop of autocratic pretensions."

The only positive reasons assigned for "surmising (it comes to no more) that the Bishops of Rome were not at the time raised so far above their presbyters as in the churches of the East," are the following:—First, the silence of St. Ignatius in his letter to the Romans. We have given reasons above for supposing this to be rather a testimony to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. Next, the fact that both St. Clement's letter, and one afterwards written by St. Soter to the Corinthians, were addressed in the name of the Church of Rome, not of the Bishops themselves. As to the latter case there can be no serious question. St. Soter had simply sent the proceeds of a collection made in Rome for the benefit of the distressed Corinthians. Their bishop, in his reply,

* τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει, καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ διαδοχῇ ἣ τε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παράδοσις, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυγμα κατήνηκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς.—Hist. Ecc. v. 6.

which was addressed to Soter, acknowledges suitably the assistance, and makes special mention of the charity with which St. Soter had "comforted their brethren who had approached him, like a loving father comforts his children, by kindly words."*

St. Clement's letter suggests some points of more interest. In the first place, no one doubts it was "drawn up by him in the name of the Roman Church;"† while at the same time the language of St. Irenæus, as well as of the epistle itself, implies that it was a letter in which the Church of Rome took part. There is nothing in this inconsistent with the personal authority of St. Clement, any more than the form of the synodical letter in Acts xv. 23, is inconsistent with the authority of the Apostles. It would appear to have been the custom of the early Pontiffs to decide nothing of importance without assembling the presbyters of Rome; as St. Victor and St. Cornelius did,‡ certainly with no idea of abandoning their own authority. Dr. Lightfoot appeals to the "Shepherd" of Hermas, as agreeing with his own "very modest estimate of St. Clement's dignity." We might ask, in reply, to what matter of discipline, or of doctrine, save the possibility of repentance, does that obscure series of allegories testify? But the writer goes out of his usual course to mention St. Clement, and to refer to his relations to the Church beyond Rome.§ And if (as seems probable) he lived at a later period, and merely borrowed the name of Clement, as he did that of Hermas, it is all the greater evidence of the relation of St. Clement to the Christian world. But there is more explicit proof of the eminent position of St. Clement, and of the source where it was derived, in a quarter which has not been sufficiently noticed. Among other arguments for episcopacy, Dr. Lightfoot very justly lays much stress upon the Clementine Homilies, a religious romance written some time during the second century, adding that their divergence from Catholic doctrine makes their agreement here all the more remarkable. Now, prefixed to these Homilies are two letters, one purporting to be from St. Peter to St. James, with which we have no more now to do, the other supposed to be written by St. Clement to St. James. This must have been written some time during the latter half of the second century; it is well known as the origin of the false Decretals. Its relation to the Clementine Homilies is uncertain; but it was

* ἐπισκόπῳ τῷ τότε Σωτῆρι προσφωνήσας . . . λόγοις μακαρίους τῶν ἀνιούτων ἀδελφόντων ὡς τέκνα πατὴρ φιλόστοργος παρακαλῶν.—Euseb. H. E. iv. 23.

† ἦν ἐκ προσώπου τῆς Ῥωμίων ἐκκλησίας τῇ κορινθίων διευπύσασα.—Id. iii. 38.

‡ Euseb. H. E., v. 23; vii. 43.

§ "Clement shall send the book (containing this revelation) to the cities abroad, for this charge is committed unto him."—Vis. ii. 4, 3.

apparently written to serve as a preface to this or some similar forgery. Dr. Lightfoot will not object to our quoting it in favour of the Primacy, as he has done with the Homilies for Episcopacy. The case is indeed a much stronger one, for the whole Clementine cycle is designed to establish an Oriental Primacy in Jerusalem, and is therefore an unwilling witness to Rome. The letter relates how Peter, "who had been defined to be the foundation of the Church . . . the first of the Apostles," foreknew his death, and appointed St. Clement as his successor, the following passages being selected from his long address to the people on the occasion: "I entrust to him my seat of teaching." "I give over to him the authority of binding and loosing, so that all he ordains on earth may be decreed in heaven." "Hear ye him, then, as knowing that whosoever grieves him who presides over the truth,* sins against Christ" (cap. 2). . . . "Do you, beloved brethren and fellow-servants, obey the president of truth in all things, knowing this, that whoso grieves him receives not Christ, whose seat he holds." Who can doubt that the author of this letter was compelled to give the attributes "Vicar of Christ," and "President of the Truth," to St. Peter's most illustrious successor, so as to colour his story with some semblance of probability? Let it be noted that we have nearly contemporaneous evidence that the Popes claimed their power as successors of St. Peter, in the frantic invective of Tertullian. We here have the corresponding admission, also from a hostile witness, that this claim was acknowledged in the East. What Dr. Lightfoot calls "the later Roman theory" can be thus traced back at least as far as the middle of the second century.

We have dwelt at length upon the points where we unhappily differ from Dr. Lightfoot; so much was due to him, as well as to the doctrines we were defending. Even here we are indebted to him for much assistance; and we have given no idea of the wealth of learning which has been lavished upon this work. It is no small lesson in this age of hurry and distraction to find any man content to give so much labour, out of a busy life, to illustrate one book. Our hearty desire is, that the saint, on whose behalf he has undertaken this labour of love, may obtain for him a fitting reward.

J. R. G.

* τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας προκαθεζόμενον. Dr. Lightfoot has noticed the remarkable parallel which this presents to St. Ignatius' προκαθήμενη τῆς ἀγάπης. It appears to us to strengthen materially the interpretation we have given of that passage.

ART. IX.—THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY.

IT has been suggested that an account of the aims and work of the Catholic Truth Society in its present form would be of interest to the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW; and it was thought that my position as one of the Honorary Secretaries gave me special opportunities for undertaking the task. Without further preface, therefore, I will begin by a statement of the circumstances which led to the revival of the Society.

Like other large undertakings, the Catholic Truth Society in its present form has risen from very small beginnings. About four years since, one of us went into one of the numerous book-shops in which cheap Anglican publications are sold, and invested half-a-crown in a selection of these. Their number, variety, attractiveness, and general excellence much impressed the two or three priests and others to whom they were shown; and the idea arose that "we Catholics" might do something of the kind. It was talked over in very various places, as opportunity served, with those likely to be favourable to the plan—in London presbyteries and country lanes, in seaside walks and city offices—and it was decided that each of us should contribute a pound, with a view of attempting on a small scale what could easily be developed should the scheme appear likely to succeed. About £12 formed our first capital, and with this we brought out the first issue of the "Little Rosary Book," of which up to the present time some 40,000 have been printed. The card of "Morning and Night Prayers for those having little time," which had been originally compiled for a Boys' Club, was also put into circulation, and a similar card of "Prayers for Confession for little children." No especial trouble was taken to gain the support of great persons, but the late Bishop of Southwark (Dr. Coffin) at once expressed his sympathy with the work, and helped us by what in those days seemed very large orders for our publications. At this time we had no name; but, having written to the Bishop of Salford, whose work in connection with popular Catholic literature is too well known to need more than a reference, his Lordship invited me to Salford, to talk the matter over. He proposed that the old name of "The Catholic Truth Society" should be revived; that means should be taken to draw the attention of Catholics in general to the work; and that a circular letter should be drawn up and sent to the clergy and others likely to interest themselves in it. He also expressed his willingness to become President of the Society, and to use his influence in making it known.

Just at this time circumstances, into which it is not necessary to enter, made it desirable that I should leave Isleworth and come to live in London. This at the moment I regretted ; but I soon saw that the Society's work could not have been carried on by any one living out of London. On November 5, 1884, a meeting was held at Lady Herbert's, under the presidency of Bishop Vaughan, at which the revival of the Catholic Truth Society was resolved upon, and various schemes for the furthering of its work were debated, the annual subscription being fixed at 10s.

It is not necessary to trace the steps—at first halting and slow, but soon becoming firmer and more rapid—by which the Society has arrived at its present position. But one or two points connected with its history deserve a word of comment.

The first is the absence of paid labour, which has enabled a Society with a very small income to achieve apparently disproportionate results. Until February last, the Society was at no expense of any kind for rent or salaries, save an almost nominal sum allowed for temporary help ; the writers of the various publications have also done their work gratuitously—in short, no one has been paid. It was only when the accumulation of stock grew beyond the limits of a small private house, that premises were taken, and a manager engaged to superintend the mechanical portion of the work ; and even this necessary expense is in some ways regrettable, as it diminishes the amount available for printing. The balance-sheet for the period between January 1, 1885, and Low Week, 1886, shows an expenditure for printing alone of £290, out of an income (from all sources) of £445 ; a balance of £71 then remained in hand—a satisfactory result in some respects, although it is not the wish of the Society to accumulate capital. The Low Week account this year, however, in spite of a largely increased income, is not likely to offend by exhibiting any considerable money balance.

Another noteworthy point is, that the Society, as it now exists, was brought into being by men almost entirely unknown, save in their own small circles. This is surely an evidence that there is in the Catholic body a great opening for work, if men will simply put their hands to what comes in their way ; it encourages one to believe that the apathy which seems to have overtaken so many of our enterprises may before long disappear ; and that the old belief, "*laborare est orare*," may once more be realized among us.

We must, however, guard ourselves against thinking that the design of promulgating cheap Catholic literature is of recent date, or that the original Catholic Truth Society led the way in the work. If we look through the pages of the various periodical publications which owed their existence to the energy and ability of William Eusebius Andrews, we shall find many evidences of

the zeal of our predecessors. To Andrews himself, indeed, may be attributed the earliest movement in this direction.* "Impressed as he was with a conviction that as, by a prostitution of the press, the public mind had so long been kept in a state of more than Egyptian darkness with respect to the true character of Catholicism, and the consequent prejudices against its professors engendered, fostered, and strengthened, so it was only by a vigorous use of the same powerful engine that we could expect to correct those erroneous impressions and remove that unchristian hostility; and hence the establishment of tract societies was always his most favourite project."† In 1813 he published a letter "urging the propriety and advantage of an institution of this description;" and in 1815, at his suggestion, a tract society was formed in the Midland District, of which Bishop Milner was President. This, however, was but short-lived; and for nearly ten years the work of publishing and circulating cheap Catholic literature was carried on by Andrews, mainly at his own expense.‡

In 1825 the Catholic Metropolitan Defence Society was formed (again mainly through Andrews' exertions), the first report of which appears in the *Catholic Miscellany* for October of that year. This report was submitted to the British Catholic Association, in union with which body the Defence Society worked. The Catholic Association, indeed, as well as its successor, the Catholic Institute, made the diffusion of literature one of its objects. It is much to be regretted that the Catholic Union, which, although in every sense less representative, occupies to some extent the ground formerly held by these bodies, has never taken any effective part in this most important work.§

It seems worth while to print at some length extracts from

* It is not altogether unimportant to note the part that laymen have always taken in movements of this kind.

† *Orthodox Journal*, September 22, 1838, p. 187.

‡ Mr. Gillow's useful "Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics" gives an account of the life and labours of this remarkable man, whose literary activity seems to have been inexhaustible. Besides the societies named in the text, he, "in 1826, established the Society of the 'Friends of Civil and Religious Liberty,' which, in little more than a year, circulated nearly half a million tracts at the small expense of £150, principally owing to Mr. Andrews' gratuitous management of the agency and correspondence."—"Biog. Dict. Eng. Cath." i. 48.

§ It is no part of my present scheme to criticise the Catholic Union, but I cannot forbear remarking in passing that its want of co-operation in any of the popular movements of the day, such as this of popular literature, the promotion of Catholic clubs, the providing of lecturers on Catholic subjects, and the like, is a serious drawback to its usefulness. It may be that the Truth Society will extend its lines, at some future period, so as to include these most important subjects within its "scope."

this first Report of the Catholic Defence Society, as it will show how fully alive the Catholics of more than sixty years back were to the importance of the work now undertaken by the Truth Society. It must be admitted by the most zealous supporters of the present Society that we have not as yet acted on as bold a plan as that carried out by the Defence Association. Some two or three enthusiastic men have, indeed, distributed our leaflets after Protestant meetings; but I am not aware that any attempt has been made to place them on the tables of places of public resort; while the "tap-rooms of public-houses" are, I imagine, as yet unvisited by our agents.

In addition to the advantages resulting from the exertions of the "Defence Committee" in circulating pamphlets and tracts in defence of the religion and principles of Catholics, it was imagined that great benefit to the same cause at a comparatively trifling expense might be effected by the circulation of handbill tracts, containing short and familiar expositions of the tenets and principles of the Catholic religion (either of original matter, or of approved extracts from works), each combating some particular popular prejudice. It was thought that such short appeals to public attention would in many instances guide opinion, where tracts of a greater length would not be perused, and that by a judicious circulation of them much might be attained towards removing the prejudices and disabusing the minds of Protestants with regard to the real tenets of Catholic faith. A society too, established for the purpose of giving them circulation, might assist the Defence Committee in distributing the publications of the association, and otherwise seconding its efforts.

At the public meetings for religious or charitable objects of every denomination of Protestants this committee has distributed its handbill tracts in great abundance. Persons have been stationed at the public meetings of Bible and other societies (particularly where the Catholic religion was likely to be assailed) to distribute them, and upwards of 8,000 have been circulated at the doors of such assemblies.

Several of the keepers of that sort of coffee-houses usually frequented by tradespeople and mechanics have consented to allow publications sent by this committee to lie on their tables for perusal; and in every part of the metropolis houses of this description have been supplied, for the purpose of thus throwing in the way of a large portion of the mechanics of the metropolis (who are now becoming a reading class of men) essays and collections of facts that must expose to them, in their proper colours, the calumnies and misrepresentations with which the principles of Catholics, and the practice, discipline, and faith of their church have been blackened.

To persons going on board the steamboats that daily leave London, and principally to those vessels that have been engaged during the summer in charitable excursions, it has been part of the plan of this committee to have its handbills and other papers handed; and on some occasions a distributor has been sent to leave them at the houses of

respectable persons in the suburbs of London. For the perusal of steamboat parties, and of those who frequent the coffee-houses before mentioned, it has been thought that the excellent work of Mr. Howard, upon "Erroneous Opinions, &c.," was peculiarly adapted, and this committee has accordingly missed no opportunity of supplying them with it, as well as with copies of the speeches of Mr. O'Connell, the Rev. Sydney Smith, at Beverley, and Mr. Butler's two letters.

For the frequenters of the tap-rooms of public-houses, and other places of public resort, tracts have been left, which, from their nature, as it is known they are read, must have an effect on opinion, proving, as they do, the fallacy of many generally received notions prejudicial to the Catholic religion, and which, as far as regard such persons, may be almost said to have hitherto remained uncontradicted.

Having had occasional applications from the country, the committee has given to its tracts a circulation in a few towns and villages. Some hundreds have been sent abroad in Colchester and its vicinity, and into the towns of Harwich, Manningtree, and Dedham, in Essex, they have been occasionally introduced. In Taunton, also, the handbill tracts have been dispersed, and about 1,500 have been furnished for circulation among the Protestant inhabitants of Canterbury. Some have been sent to Sunderland; and in the neighbourhood of the metropolis, persons in Stratford, Chelsea, Greenwich, and part of Hertfordshire, have been supplied.

The committee is also engaged in a plan for employing the clubs and meetings of mechanics as a plan for giving circulation to its papers amongst that class of the community.

About 15,000 tracts of various descriptions have been sent abroad by this committee (nearly 2,000 of which have been those supplied by the Defence Committee), and it flatters itself that the mode in which they have been circulated has been such as to ensure them effect. Aware that hitherto in reality it has accomplished but little, this committee has the satisfaction of knowing that it has laid the foundation of a most extensive system of circulation, and of sending forth for perusal defensive tracts among every description of English Protestants. Its resources hitherto have allowed it to carry into effect only a very small part of what its system embraces; but it has hopes that when its objects are understood by Catholics that it will not want their support, and that it will be enabled to carry on with vigour operations that must contribute towards removing prejudices and opinions that have so long and so grievously wronged their religion.

The committee has to thank the Catholic Association for the support it has tendered, as well as for the tracts that have been received from the Defence Committee of that body.

This Report will at any rate serve to remind the members of the Truth Society that, in spite of the energy that they have undoubtedly displayed, we at present in some respects actually fall short of those who preceded us in the work. We are, indeed, as yet in want of many kinds of help; we need distributors, and we need funds. Immediately on the formation of the Defence Society ten thousand handbills were distributed gratui-

tously ; if this means that the Society was at the expense of their distribution, we of the present body cannot claim to have done as much.

But we must pass on. In 1832, or before, Catholic literary activity had found another channel. There was at that period a "Catholic Society for the Distribution of Prayer-Books, Catechisms, &c.," as we learn from a letter, addressed to the secretary of that body by a priest at Rio de Janeiro, which is published in the *Catholic Magazine* for October of that year. His appeal is very earnest and touching, and, it is to be hoped, met with a liberal response. In the hospitals, he says, "Divine providence has made me the humble instrument of many conversions of Protestants to our holy faith. . . . If able to read, I lend them such books of devotion as I have ; and, when not, by my daily attendance on them, they become attached to me, and place confidence in my instructions ; and it is in these cases that I find the want of books of devotion. I have really been obliged to tear a prayer-book into three parts, to distribute to different wards." Work of this kind—i.e., the supplying of prayer-books and other devotional literature—has from the first been included in the scope of the revived Truth Society.

In 1834 it was thought advisable to form a special "Tract Society," apart from the Metropolitan Catholic Defence Society, and for that purpose a meeting was held on Sunday evening, September 28, "which was so numerously attended that many were disappointed in gaining entrance to the room."* "No sooner had the tree taken root," continues the writer, "than it opened forth its branches throughout the entire kingdom, and similar societies, acting in co-operation with the present institution, were quickly established in Liverpool, Macclesfield, Newcastle, North and South Shields, Darlington, West Bromwich, Dudley, Salford, Stockport, Clitheroe, Skipton, &c."† In 1838, on the formation of the Catholic Institute, the Tract Society was amalgamated with that body, having circulated upwards of 80,000 tracts and other publications during its brief existence.

* *Orthodox Journal*, Sept. 22, 1838. The whole article deserves careful attention.

† The *Orthodox Journal* of Sept. 24, 1836, contains an article on "Distribution of Tracts," at the end of which is "a list of tracts already issued." These are divided into "Moral (7)," "Controversial" (11), and "Miscellaneous" (6). The two first were issued in wrapper at 1d. each, 9d. per dozen, or 5s. 6d. per 100 ; and it may be noted that the "controversial" series, judging from the titles, consists rather of instructions and explanations relating to the sacraments and other mysteries of religion than of what we should now call controversy. Certain popular Protestant objections—as that of celebrating Mass in the Latin tongue—are treated in the "miscellaneous" section, the prices of which ranged from ½d., or 2s. per 100, to 2d., or 10s. per 100. It is noteworthy that what are now

With the establishment of the Catholic Institute, a new epoch was inaugurated in the history of Catholicism in England. A sketch of this body has been published quite lately, and I do not propose to do more than call attention to its action in reference to Catholic literature. In its preliminary announcement, which is a comprehensive summary of its aims, "the particular objects of the Catholic Institute" are thus stated :—

1. To meet the calumnious charges against the Catholic religion, whenever refutation may be deemed necessary, by the publication of accredited tracts or pamphlets or otherwise.
2. To defend the doctrines of the Catholic religion by distributing tracts and works duly approved of by a clergyman authorized by the Bishop of the London District, for the purpose of explaining its principles and practices.

N.B.—In most cases such tracts and treatises, as far as the funds of the Institute may permit, will be distributed gratuitously, either through the medium of the resident clergymen in their respective localities, or through members of the general and local committees. And every member of the Institute shall be entitled to receive a certain quantity of tracts, to be lent out to his Protestant friends and neighbours. Whenever it shall be deemed advisable by the resident clergyman, or by the general or local committees, to circulate tracts at any public meeting held for the purpose of attacking the Catholic religion, these will be furnished by the general secretary on being applied for.

3. Another object of the Institute is to put the poorer classes of Catholics in possession of books of piety and devotion at the lowest possible price; and in cases where persons are too poor to purchase, to supply them gratuitously.

The two other objects specified are not connected with literature, but it is noteworthy that three of the five bear on the subject.

Space will not allow me to pass in review the numerous and excellent publications of the Institute; but I may be allowed to quote what I have written elsewhere regarding them.

A glance at the tracts* issued enables us to realize the changed attitude of the public mind on religious questions. Fifty years ago, the modern doubts and difficulties were almost unknown, so far as the popular intelligence was concerned. The defence of the Church against Methodists and the Church of England; evidences from Scripture on disputed points, the Written Word being regarded as a court

the prominent points of controversy between Catholics and Anglicans—such as the "continuity" and "Catholicity" of the Established Church—find no place in these lists. Could any more striking evidence be adduced than that which this silence affords to the marvellous change of front adopted by Anglicans during the last fifty years?

* There is still in some quarters a prejudice against the use of this convenient word, which, however, appears at the head of all the publications of the Institute.

of final appeal; the publications of Bishop Milner and Bishop Challoner—these and others like them were the accepted antidotes to the errors of the time. It was not the very foundations of religion which were then assailed; those who denounced “Popery” would have defended their Christianity at all hazards, and their very zeal for the latter, as they understood it, led to their attacks upon the former. It was not so clear then as it is now—although there were signs and portents abroad—that the struggle would ultimately resolve itself into a war between Catholicity and Infidelity; and a demonstration that the Catholic Church truly represented Bible Christianity removed, perhaps, at that period the greatest obstacle to conversion. Men then, as a rule implicitly believed in the Bible; but this can scarcely be said to be the case now.*

The publications were circulated in large quantities, and often gratuitously. Thus, an edition of 10,000 copies of a tract entitled “Instruction on Christian Faith and Morality” was “printed for gratuitous circulation among the poor;” in 1841 3,000 tracts were circulated in Bristol alone, through the “auxiliary” established in that town; 15,000 of an “Abridgment of Catholic Doctrine” was printed; a Gaelic prayer-book was undertaken; tracts were sent to New Zealand, Malta, Madras, Sydney, Rio Janeiro, the Cape, and elsewhere. Reports like these, which may be taken as samples of a crowd of others, show that the Catholic Institute was no mere name, but an active working body, such as we at the present day stand greatly in need of. At present, our forces are wasted for want of centralization. The work which the Catholic Union was founded to do, as well as that of the St. Anselm’s Society, of the Conference of Catholic Clubs, and of Catholic Registration organizations—all these, as well as the various activities brought into play by the Catholic Truth Society, might well come within the scope of some one Catholic body. In the days of the Catholic Institute, such a union of interests, if not formulated, was largely carried out; and it is possible that a fusion may yet take place between some at least of the bodies enumerated above.

Before coming to the immediate prototype of the present Truth Society, there is one point which deserves more attention than can now be bestowed upon it, but to which a passing reference may be made. With the exception of the Vicars-Apostolic—British and colonial—who appear as patrons, the whole management and control of the Catholic Institute appear to have been in the hands of the laity, and of a much more representative body of the laity than is to be found on the council of any existing institution, except, perhaps, the Truth Society. More than this: any one looking through lists of Catholic societies of

* *Month*, May, 1886.

different kinds—such as charitable and social bodies, school committees, and the like—or reading the accounts of meetings to promote Catholic interests, as reported in the Catholic magazines and newspapers of from sixty to thirty years since, cannot fail to be struck with the more prominent position occupied in those days by the laity in Catholic affairs as compared with that which they now hold. Two or three explanations of this might be given, but the present is not the occasion for them. But of the fact there can be little doubt.*

It was not apparently until 1868 that the work of propagating Catholic literature was again taken up. The present Bishop of Salford (then Rector of St. Joseph's Missionary College, Mill Hill) was the prime organizer of the work, which took the name of the Catholic Truth Society, and attracted to itself various representative Catholics, some of whom are intimately connected with the Society in its present revived form. Its prospectus is worth printing for comparison with that of the earlier Society already given, and with that of the present Society, which will be found later on:—

The spread of education among all classes in England during the present century is a fact which no one can regard without some degree of national pride and yet with intense anxiety.

In the very proportion that our working-men are educated, their danger from infidel and rationalistic publications increases, and of such there is a deluge at this moment, not only in our own land but throughout Europe.

But we Catholics have another enemy to contend with: the Tract Societies—which annually distribute some fifty or sixty million of publications, a large proportion of which are direct and often blasphemous attacks on the Catholic faith, couched in language which only religious fanaticism can excuse, and not only impugning the truth of all we hold most dear, but prejudging in a marked degree our position and rights as Catholic citizens. To counteract this evil there is but one way: to meet them on their own ground, to make use of the same engine, the Press—that instrument so mighty for good or for evil, which Leo X. speaks of as “an art happily invented for the glory of God, the spread of the Faith, and the diffusion of useful knowledge.”

For these purposes, therefore, we propose to establish a Society, to be called

The Catholic Truth Society, for the Better Information of the English People.

In doing so we have two objects in view:

1. The instruction and benefit of our own people, many of whom are lamentably ignorant of the “reason of the hope that is in them.”

* One cause, no doubt, is to be found in the alienation of Irish Catholics from English Catholic interests. The leading speaker at the first Annual Meeting of the Catholic Institute was Daniel O'Connell. Can any one imagine, say, the present Lord Mayor of Dublin speaking at the Catholic Union?

And this is the more important at the present time, when every newspaper teems with religious discussions; when religious topics are made the subject of common conversation among all classes—in drawing-rooms as in public-houses; in railway carriages as in steamboats; everywhere and at all times and seasons controversial points are brought forward, and an accurate knowledge of the Catholic answers to be given is of paramount importance.

2. The dissipating popular prejudice and error in the minds of our non-Catholic population—prejudices which have been instilled into them from their childhood, and which have been accepted without doubt or hesitation; and thus counteracting the influence of false teachers and their instruments, the Tract Societies, which, for above a century, have been pouring falsehoods into the ears and the homes of our peasantry.

At the same time, every effort will be made to soften prejudice by conciliatory language, winning souls by love and not by bitterness, and remembering the words of St. Francis of Sales, “that more hearts are gained by a spoonful of honey than by tunsful of vinegar.”

The Society proposes to print and distribute short tracts, in large, bold type, at the cheapest possible rate; these will naturally fall under five heads:—

1. Apologetic and explanatory of Catholic faith and practice, to meet the rationalism, indifferentism, and religious diversities of the day.
2. Popular refutations of popular prejudices—*e.g.*, that Catholicity is un-English, or unscriptural, &c.
3. Testimonies of popular Protestant writers in favour of the Catholic Church and against the Reformation—*e.g.*, Macaulay, Hallam, Cobbett, &c.
4. Practical for Catholics, moral and dogmatic, to be distributed among families by the children of the Poor School, by the clergy and visitors of the sick, &c.
5. Songs and ballads.

Many of these tracts will be distributed (as is done by others) in the streets, in the parks and other places of public resort on Sundays, at the church doors, in the cottages of our country population, in the courts of our great towns where our poor are crowded—in fact, as the apostle says, “in season and out of season.” On other days, a certain number of respectable men and women of the poorer classes may be employed as hawkers for the purpose of sale or distribution.

The new Society was welcomed by the Catholic press, and supported by many clergy and laity: it was indulged by the Holy Father, and seemed likely to become a success. Its publications were varied, and so far satisfactory that some have been reprinted by the present Society, and others would have been so but for transference of copyright. Yet after two or three years, mainly, I believe, owing to the appointment of its founder to the bishopric of Salford, it gradually fell away. We can only suppose that the time for the creation of a Catholic popular

literature had not yet come ; and that the few publications of the original Truth Society were but as the drops which come before the copious and refreshing rain. It may be noticed in passing that the Society restricted itself to "the cheapest publications, to be sold at a farthing, a halfpenny, or a penny each"—some, however, were published at twopence. The present organization, while rightly making cheap publications its special care, has never committed itself to any such restriction, and, indeed, will no doubt develop in the direction of undertaking larger and more important works than it has yet issued.

What may be the future of the Catholic Truth Society, none can tell. With the blessing of God, it may be a great one. The Society certainly has in it many elements of success. It is probably the most representative body which we at present possess : clergy of all ranks, religious of almost every order and congregation, laymen of position and education, and working men who have neither, but who yield to none in their desire for the spread of truth, are among its most active workers. The laity as well as the clergy are adequately represented on its committees ; and this is an advantage, not only to the Society in particular, but to the Catholic cause in general—an advantage the strength of which is sometimes overlooked. Men of all shades of politics are associated in the Society, and this again is well. We are sometimes told that it would be impossible to form a "Catholic Party." As to this, I am not capable of expressing an opinion ; but the earnestness with which men of different position and views have worked together in the interests of the Truth Society would lead me to think the experiment not altogether hopeless.

The objects of the Society were thus stated in its prospectus, drawn up early in 1885 :—

1st.—To disseminate among Catholics small and cheap devotional works. There is always a demand for such publications in every congregation if they can be had cheaply, and are ready to hand. At the time of a Retreat or Mission, hundreds or even thousands of them might be taken by the people.

2nd.—To assist the uneducated poor to a better knowledge of their religion. Most Catholics are attacked from time to time by the sneers or objections of Protestants, and too often have no answer ready. If their own faith is not weakened, their inability to state or defend the Church's doctrine does harm to others. It is also desirable to furnish Catholic artisans in the great centres of industry with answers to the rationalistic and infidel theories which are constantly the subject of conversation among men employed in factories and workshops. For the benefit of these classes, we propose to issue a number of pamphlets and cafllets to help them to withstand attack, and to give them a better knowledge of their religion.

3rd.—To spread among Protestants information about Catholic truth. Prejudice and error are still universal among the English poor, but there are many who would readily accept the teaching of the Church, were they not so utterly misinformed respecting it. While the Religious Tract Society and other similar bodies spread their misleading publications with untiring energy, Catholics do little in this way to make known the claims of the Church of God, and to destroy the absurd notions respecting her that Protestant tradition has handed down. Short papers or leaflets with striking titles, containing a summary of doctrine or concise replies to popular objections, would be eagerly read by Protestants if distributed among them or given away at the doors before or after anti-Catholic lectures, &c.

4th.—To promote the circulation of the good, cheap, and popular Catholic works which already exist, many of them being at present almost unknown, and to take notice of similar books as they appear.

To some extent, all these objects have been carried out, and the work has been taken up with much energy by various bodies especially suited to furthering Catholic enterprise. Such are some of our Colleges, the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul, and certain local associations formed for the special purpose of diffusing the leaflets and other publications. The scope of the Society has been enlarged since this scheme was put forward. A series of Biographies, and another of Tales and Poems, has been undertaken; and these, collected into shilling volumes, have already had a large sale in that form. Of a penny and halfpenny Prayer-book, an edition of 20,000 was exhausted in less than six months. The pamphlets and leaflets on the Anglican question have been largely employed in combating the attempts of Anglicans to establish the continuity of the present Establishment with the pre-Reformation Church. Of a pamphlet on the education question, more than 40,000 have been sold; and the leaflets on the same subject have had a large sale. The more usual Protestant misconceptions have been once more refuted; while pamphlets and leaflets dealing with Socialism and Positivism have been issued. These are only some of the matters which have been taken up by the Truth Society; but even from this summary it will be seen that the plan of operation is much more extended than has been the case with any of its predecessors. Its last work of importance has been the issue, at a very low cost, of short biographies of all the English Martyrs recently beatified.

This is an encouraging record of little more than two years' work; but it is felt by all who are engaged in it that it is but the beginning of what may be, with God's blessing, a permanent undertaking—equal, in its way, in importance and influence, to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Religious Tract Society. Already the interest shown at home in the work has been echoed from abroad. To every quarter of

the globe the publications of the Society have found their way, and wherever they have gone they have also found a welcome. But it is more seemly that others should speak on this point ; and the recent Lenten pastoral of the venerable Bishop of Birmingham showed in what light the Society is regarded by one who is perhaps more intimately associated than any other with the recent history of the Church in England. If any exception can be taken to this statement, it will be with regard to another name, not less honoured and venerated—that of the illustrious Cardinal whose home is also in Birmingham ; and it is with the greatest satisfaction that we are able to record Cardinal Newman's warm and practical interest in our work, manifested as it has been in many different ways. The English Hierarchy has approved the scheme ; and, among the other eminent ecclesiastics who have expressed their interest in its promotion, may be named the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Archbishop of Bombay, and the Archbishop of San Francisco.

What, then, is wanted to ensure the success of the Catholic Truth Society ? and what will be the result of that success ? For the first, the active co-operation of the laity is necessary. True, the support and countenance of the clergy is an essential condition of our very existence ; but this has already been secured in far greater proportion than that of the laity. It is the latter more especially that the Bishop of Salford is addressing when he says :—

We are in the age of the Apostolate of the Press. It can penetrate where no Catholic can enter. It can do its work as surely for God as for the devil. It is an instrument in our hands.

All should take part in this apostolate ; here at least there is work for every one. For ten who can write, ten thousand can subscribe, and a hundred thousand can scatter the seed. For this purpose, under the patronage of the Hierarchy, and richly indulged by the Holy See, the Catholic Truth Society has been founded by a number of priests and laymen. It is already doing good work ; but the good work ought to be multiplied through every town and mission, not in England only, but throughout the British Empire. It instructs, edifies, and amuses, it educates and evangelizes Catholics and non-Catholics. It will become an engine of gigantic power in the service of God, if our men and women have in them only the hearts and wills to become apostles.

Say not that to scatter books, pamphlets, tracts, and leaflets is waste and loss, if you have but a grain of faith in the Gospel parable of the sower. God Himself, with bountiful hand, is always sowing his grace over the world of men, and what is the history of his sowing ? Is greater fruit to spring up under the hand of the servant than of the Master ? But for every effort we make, there is an eternal reward.

We need writers, a multitude of subscribers, and a numberless body of men and women sowing and scattering the truth wherever English is read and spoken. This means zeal, time, labour, and, we may add, humility, for the work has not the apparent dignity of debates on public questions and passing resolutions, though it will be at least as certain of its spiritual results.

And for the answer to the second question—what will be the result of the success of the Society?—I would say the result will be twofold. One part of it will be the permanent establishment of a publishing body, not aiming at gain, but at edification; not spending its income in lavish salaries and sounding speeches, but a body to which every Catholic—from the priest who needs weapons of defence wherewith to arm his people against the wiles of heresy, or weapons of attack to employ upon the evils of all kinds which surround him, to the working man in the factory who is assailed by blasphemies and taunts against his holy religion, and needs the means for strengthening himself and for repelling the attack—may turn for counsel and support. Every kind of literature that a Catholic can require will be provided by the Society: devotion and practice, biography and history, tales and poetry, social and religious publications—all will be forthcoming. In a word, whatever is done for Protestants on a magnificent scale by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge will be undertaken—in a proportionately smaller but not less efficacious manner—by the Catholic Truth Society.

And the other result, which we may fairly expect, will be the edification of Catholics and the instruction of Protestants. The calumnies and falsehoods which are accepted in all good faith by many outside the Church, and which are disseminated by others in whose sincerity we should be glad to believe, though we find it difficult to do so, will receive prompt and plain refutation—whether they spring from the newest and most insidious form of Protestantism known as Ritualism, or whether they take the grosser form of the filthy fictions of the class of “Maria Monk” and the like. Not neglecting our own people and their many needs, we shall aim at the instruction and conversion of those outside the church; and our efforts can hardly fail to be blest. Blest, indeed, they have been already, by the approval of the Vicar of God upon earth, and by the visible success which has attended them; and it is therefore with every confidence that we call upon all to come forward, and share in the work which is now ready to their hands.

JAMES BRITTEN.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

Persian Life and Manners.—Mr. Benjamin* has turned to good account his diplomatic sojourn as United States Minister in Teheran, by giving the public the benefit of the intimate knowledge of the country thus acquired in a book which combines in a rare degree entertainment with instruction. Instead of the personal narrative affected by the ordinary writer of travels, he has divided his book into chapters, each treating of a separate branch of the subject, and forming a valuable and delightful essay thereupon. Thus one chapter contains a fascinating description of Persian country villas; a second gives a thrilling picture of the performance of the great Shah Mystery Play on the death of Hussein and Hassan, witnessed by the author in the royal amphitheatre at Teheran; a third is devoted to Persian art; a fourth to mountaineering in Persia, and especially to the perils and beauties of the great Atcha Pass, 13,000 feet high.

Among interesting facts to be gleaned from his pages is the Persian origin of the manufacture of the so-called Russia leather, with the strange legend that its peculiar properties are due to the hides being exposed on a very high mountain to be struck by lightning. The inviolability of a stable as a sanctuary for criminals, who, while sheltered there, must be fed by the owner, and are safe from the wrath of the Shah himself, is a singular trait of Persian manners, whose origin the author says is lost in obscurity.

Commercial Resources of Persia.—Despite the great salt deserts which occupy so large a portion of its area, Mr. Benjamin believes Persia to be capable of great future development. With the most primitive agricultural appliances, wheat is already grown in sufficient quantity for exportation, and rice, the staple food of the people, is supplied in abundance from the alluvial lands on the Caspian shore. The grape of Kasvin is proverbial for its excellence, and with improved methods wine of a high quality might be produced. The Persian opium is the best in the world, and 2,000 chests are annually exported to England alone from Bushire. The silk trade of Persia has always been eagerly competed for among foreign nations, and Mr. Benjamin estimates the annual production of raw silk at 608,000 lbs., of which about 15 per cent. is retained for domestic consumption. The far-famed Persian rugs and carpets depend for their beauty on the individual taste of the makers, and it is to be hoped that the attempt of European merchants to introduce wholesale methods of manufacture will not rob them of their

* "Persia and the Persians." By S. G. W. Benjamin. London: John Murray. 1877.

excellence. The importation of aniline dyes is strictly prohibited in the interests of this artistic industry.

Considerable coal deposits exist in Persia, and a bituminous coal is used in Teheran as fuel for steam machinery. Turquoise mines are a large source of revenue, but that from the pearl fisheries in the Persian Gulf is much diminished, owing to the want of proper restrictions for the preservation of the oyster. Mr. Benjamin does not, however, believe that a railway through Persia could be profitably made, owing to the sparseness of the population and vast distances to be traversed.

The Far North-West.—Mr. Elliott's* interesting volume gives us the first comprehensive survey published of the great territory of Alaska, with its area of 512,000 square miles, greater than that of the German and Austrian Empires together, forming one-sixth of the entire dominions of the United States. Its natural features are on a corresponding scale, and Mount Wrangel, its great volcano, 20,000 feet high, overtops all other peaks in North America, while its principal river, the Yukon, with a length of 2,000 miles, disputes the primacy of the Mississippi in actual volume of water. The immense westerly extension gained by the United States in the purchase of this territory from Russia, is shown by the fact that Attou, the most distant port in the Aleutian chain, is three thousand miles west of San Francisco, which is thus situated almost half-way between it and the Eastern or Atlantic sea-board.

The Seal Islands.—Mr. Elliott was sent out by the United States Government specially to study the habits and natural history of the fur seal, and the most interesting part of his book is that which relates to the Pribylov Islands of St. Paul and St. George in Bering Sea, the chief known breeding-place of those strange mammals. They begin to arrive in May, swarming out of the sea in countless millions, and occupying the rocky shore in what are called rookeries. the scene of terrific single combats between the old males or "bulls," who hotly contest the possession of every inch of crag for the accommodation of their families. The younger males, up to six or seven years old, called "holloschuckies," are not admitted to these reserved grounds, and herd in separate localities, whence they are driven to the slaughtering-places for the yearly battue. The charter of the company (Alaska Trading Company) only permits them to take 100,000 skins, and that number of animals are killed and flayed between June 14 and August 1. Although the great mass of the carcasses are left to decay on the spot, producing such exhalations as may easily be imagined, no epidemic or other malady has ever been developed by this accumulation of putrefaction.

Kamschatkan Volcanoes.—The record of the cruise of the *Marchesa†* contains most vivid pictures, both from pen and pencil, of

* "Our Arctic Province." By Henry W. Elliott. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1886.

† "The Cruise of the 'Marchesa' to Kamschatka and New Guinea." By F. H. H. Guillemard. London: John Murray. 1886.

some of the more remote parts of the earth's surface. Mr. Guille-mard's journey through the interior of Kamschatka brings before us the existence of one of the most splendid groups of volcano peaks in existence, forming a range of snow-covered pyramids varying in height between 8,000 and 17,000 feet. It is an interesting fact, hitherto little noticed, that some of these craters burst into activity almost simultaneously with the eruption of Krakatoa, showing the continuity of the plutonic belt from the South to the North Pacific. From one of the cones, 17,000 feet high, a pillar of flame was launched 8,000 to 10,000 feet into the air, and was distinctly seen at a distance of from 200 to 250 miles. This was in the month of July, 1883, preceding the great Javan eruption which took place on the 26th of August.

Scenery of Formosa.—The eastern coast of Formosa forms a stupendous wall of precipice, rising from 5,000 to 7,000 feet sheer from the sea. This giant scarp is cleft by huge gorges on a corresponding scale of majestic size, the mountains which hem them in on every side being clothed with the rankest tropical vegetation. Rattan and bamboo luxuriate here, and the island contains thirteen varieties of the latter. Tea is an article of export, and the camphor-tree, which grows to a considerable size, abounds in the primeval forest. Among other objects of commerce are jute, indigo, tobacco, grass-cloth fibre, and rice paper, made from the pith of *Aralia papyrifera*, a plant peculiar to the island.

British North Borneo.—The further extension of the cruise of the *Marchesa* enabled her owner to report on the progress made, down to his visit in 1883, by the British North Borneo Company, constituted by Royal Charter on November 1, 1881, with practically sovereign rights over 24,000 square miles of territory. They have 600 miles of coast-line, with several excellent harbours, and one river navigable for 200 miles by large steam-launches, while their dominions also contain Kina Bala—the greatest mountain in the island, attaining a height of 13,700 feet. Of their five settlements, Elopura is the chief, with a population which had grown, chiefly by Chinese immigration from 2,000 at the beginning of 1882, to 5,000 in April of the following year. Its name, meaning "Beautiful City," is somewhat of a euphuism, as it consists, like all Malay towns, of thatch-covered mat-built huts raised on piles generally in the water. The harbour is, however, a magnificent one, with an entrance a mile wide, and a length of sixteen miles. Close to it are the caves containing the edible swallow's nests, which form its principal export. The natural products of the island are of great value, comprising camphor, gutta-percha, rattan, pearl-shell, and coal; but the labour difficulty will render any form of agricultural development almost impossible, as the combined heat and damp of the climate make it unfit for permanent settlement by Europeans. A tax on the export of swallow's nests forms a considerable item of the revenue, the duty, when charged at the rate of 5 per cent.—which has since been doubled—having amounted in six months to 1,100 dollars.

General Prjevalsky on Central Asia.—The following summary of the Russian explorer's general estimate of Central Asia, intended to form the introductory chapter of his forthcoming book, is extracted from the *Times*, of February 3, 1887. Of the vast tract vaguely included under the above term, he estimates the total population at about 9,000,000, spread over an extent of 120,000 square miles. The insignificance of the figure is accounted for by the conformation of the country, of which four-fifths are desert, with only a few oases at the foot of gigantic mountains furnishing soil fit for settled cultivation. These places have consequently been inhabited from a very early date, forming historical and geographical landmarks amid the surrounding waste. Extreme laziness and egotism, with a total indifference to all save satisfying their bodily wants as easily as possible, are asserted to be the chief characteristics of the whole population, Jakouts, Turcomans, Dongans, and Kirghiz, despite differences of race, religion, and manners. Like all peoples living under Asiatic despotisms, they are devoid of the ideas of virtue, honour, or duty, and exhibit no leanings towards any form of European culture and civilization. Power of deception, especially if exercised on Europeans, is the quality they most pride themselves on, and the family life of the sedentary populations is described as disfigured by tyranny and immorality. The nomads are exempted from these severe strictures, and are said to be more amiable and truthful than their settled brethren.

Russian Influence in China.—Perhaps a hint as to the future direction of Russia's Asiatic policy may be found in the General's views as to the subjects of China, and their earnest longings to exchange the rule of Peking for that of St. Petersburg. The dream of the nomadic Mongols, the Dongans, or Chinese Mohammedans, as well as of the inhabitants of Eastern Turkestan, is to become subjects of the Great White Tsar, whose name figures in their imaginations beside that of the Dalai Lama of Tibet, as the symbol of mystical power and authority.

Discontent with Chinese Rule.—At some places visited by the expedition, the Mohammedan mollahs implored the General to let them rise and massacre all the Chinese in the district in the name of the Tsar. "Only trumpet the Tsar's name," they said, "from the mountain-tops, and not a single Chinese will live." The insupportable oppression of China, contrasted with the order and prosperity introduced by Russia, are represented as inevitably tending to push forward the dominion of the latter. A terrible picture is drawn of the government of cruelty and oppression systematically practised by the Chinese officials, under whom neither life or property is safe, while taxation weighs heavily on the poor. A more energetic policy on the part of Russia is advocated by the General, who states that the yielding character of her proceedings hitherto, particularly in the retrocession of the Ili province of Kuldja, have been set down by Chinese intriguers to timidity and impotence. These significant arguments would seem to point to a repetition of the story of Bulgaria in the extreme East.

English Travellers in Afghanistan.—The *Times* of January 1, 1887, gives a summary of the recent journey of Captains Maitland and Tulbot, who left the main body of the Afghan Boundary Commission to the west of Herat at the close of 1885 to explore the direct route to Cabul by the valley of the Heri-Rud and Bamian. Within a few marches of the head-quarters camp they met a party of Afghans, who, were it not for the break-down of their baggage ponies, would have reached Herat in nine days from Cabul by this route, travelling forty miles a day. The superiority of this direct line of communication over the other circuitous routes is proved by its use for military transport by the officers of the Ameer, and a convoy of arms and ammunition, escorted by four hundred men armed with Sniders, was passed on its way to Herat, followed by another, consisting of a hundred bullocks with lead for the arsenal.

The Hazara Country.—The Hazarajat, a mountainous region inhabited by the Hazaras, was entered after leaving the Heri Valley, and many misconceptions as to the character of this people are corrected by the accounts of the travellers. Instead of a turbulent and warlike race, they were found to be a simple, industrious, and pacific people, easily governed and comparatively tractable. The disorders of the country previous to the accession of Abdurrahman were due to dissensions among the chiefs, and here, as elsewhere throughout his dominions, peace and tranquillity have been re-established by the present ruler of Afghanistan. The naturally orderly character of the population is proved by the absence of crime, theft being almost unknown, and but one murder having been committed over a large tract of country in a period of twelve years.

The landscape had a softer aspect than elsewhere in Afghanistan, recalling the Highlands of Scotland, and there is generally sufficient depth of soil to support conifers if artificially planted, as well as Himalayan oaks and rhododendrons. There is a considerable population, and a good deal of cultivation, mostly on the hill-sides but sometimes extending to the summits. Pulse and barley are the main crops, and large flocks of sheep and goats are scattered over the pastures. Previous travellers have not exaggerated the severity of the winter, as the snow which begins to fall heavily in November, remains on the ground until the 21st of March. The country, after it melts, is rendered impassable even for pedestrians by the state of the roads, slippery with clayey mud, and by the swollen streams, converted into raging torrents, this transition period lasting from forty to sixty days according to the amount of snow-fall. The road, constructed by the present Ameer, is still being improved in order to render it passable for artillery, but is very far removed from the English ideal, as it scorns indirect methods, and surmounts all obstacles in a nearly straight line.

Source of the River of Balkh.—The Bakkak Kotal or pass is the most serious obstacle to communication between Herat and Bamian. It leads into the Yak Walang valley, "a large marsh watered by the upper course of the Balkh-ab, or river of Balkh, the

principal source of which lies at the Band-i-Barbar, a series of five curious natural dams, forming seven narrow lakes with water of the deepest blue and of extraordinary clearness."

Ancient Ruins.—In this district are the ruins of some of the old fortified towns which studded Northern Afghanistan at the time of Chinghiz Khan's invasion, and the study of whose remains might throw much light on its history. One of these, occupying a scarped height overlooking the Yak Walang valley, is called Shahar-i-Barbar, and is said to have been the capital of early kings ruling a people called Barbar—in Arabic, mountaineer. Captain Maitland believes them to have been of the same race as the Tajiks living near Badakshan, a people of the primitive Aryan stock.

Gigantic Idols.—At Bamian, where the party were hospitably received in a village consisting of a few forts, they remained several days spent in examining the huge sculptured idols, the largest 120 and 180 feet high, as well as caves and other antiquities, the interest of which, in Captain Maitland's opinion, compensated all the fatigues of the journey.

Afghan Turkestan.—This northern province of the Ameer consists mainly of an alluvial plain, stretching in a level expanse from the last spurs of the hills to the south to the banks of the Oxus. It is watered by the Tashkurgan and Band-i-Barbar rivers, diverted into numerous irrigation canals and ditches. The capital of the province is Mazar-i-Sharif, a town rapidly increasing in size, and quite overshadowing its decaying neighbour Balkh. Its streets are intersected by canals and diversified with plane trees and other foliage, "above which rise the blue-tiled domes of the Mosalla, supposed to be built over the grave of Ali, although, of course, the real tomb of that worthy is at Kerbela." The Governor-General, the Sirdar Ishak Khan, a great magnate who affects royal State, is suspected of regarding himself as the future Sovereign of Afghanistan. Meantime he is a good administrator and humane ruler of his province. The Uzbeks, who constitute three-fourths of the population, are well treated and have no grievances to complain of.

Captain Talbot's journey occupied exactly three months, during which 1,000 miles were traversed and about 9,000 square miles carefully surveyed. The party were everywhere well received, all the officials showing eagerness in welcoming and assisting them; the villagers being friendly and pacific, and the country to all appearance perfectly safe.

New Soudan Expedition.—Mr. Stanley's expedition for the relief of Emin Bey promises valuable geographical results, apart from the attainment of its main object. Organized at Zanzibar, and consisting of 1,000 or 1,200 men, it is expected that it will reach the mouth of the Congo, by steamer round the Cape, about the beginning of May, and two months more is probably a sanguine estimate of the time required for its transport thence to the southern confines of the Egyptian Soudan. Steam transport, with one break of road, will be available on the river to the point near the Equator station,

where it will have to be abandoned for a stretch of some 300 miles across an entirely unknown country. If, this proves to be a forest-covered region, Mr. Stanley expects to see it in thirty days, but ten miles a day seems a high average for African travel. The most important outstanding geographical problem in Africa, the relative positions of the Nile and Congo basins, is here waiting for solution, together with the social task of striking at the roots of the slave-trade, which draws its principal supplies from the same country. It is well known that this was Gordon's purpose, postponed to the claim of his own country on his services, in accepting the command of the Upper Congo, and we may now hope to see the same result achieved by the man who was to have been his colleague. The expedition is accompanied by several African boys, educated in this country, and expected to be of use in communicating with their countrymen, and among them is the little son of the chief of the Aruwimi country, who made such a strenuous resistance to Stanley's passage of the mouth of that river, on his first adventurous voyage down the Congo.

Notes on Novels.

Shc. By H. RIDER HAGGARD. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1887.

THOSE who were fascinated by the weird extravagance of "King Solomon's Mines" will find a worthy successor to it in the author's new tale of diablerie and adventure. The scene is again laid in Africa, and another quest is the subject, the ancient record which forms the motive spring of the travellers being in this case a family relic, transmitted to the hero through an ancestry traced back to the Pharaohs. A shard, or fragment of pottery, covered with inscriptions of various dates and in many languages, including uncial Greek and black-letter English, is the memorial of this strange pedigree, and of the attempts made in many generations to fulfil an early mandate of vengeance against a mysterious sorceress dwelling in Eastern Africa. This long-bequeathed behest is obeyed by the hero, with results which we will not mar the reader's pleasure by anticipating. The Ama-hagger, or People of the Rocks, among whom he encounters his strange experiences, have their prototypes in a tribe in Madagascar bearing a like name, Antankarana, in their own language. The natural fortress in which they dwell is exactly similar to the one described, since it is formed of an extinct crater, whose cliff-like walls enclose an area of about eight square miles. This plain is accessible from without only by a chasma or

tunnel piercing the rock-barrier, with deep water on either side of the narrow path leading through it. It is to be regretted that, despite the great merits of the book, it contains some passages which render it unsuitable to be put into the hands of young people.

In the Clouds. By CHARLES EGBERT CRADDOCK. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887.

THE author of "The Prophet of the Great Smoky Mountains," with that subtle magic of words which can call up visions, transports us into a new and unknown region, and makes it familiar as a part of our own experience. The mountains of Tennessee, with their illimitable breadths of sun and shadow, are, in this as in her former work, the background of her picture, and the wild and lawless population of their slopes furnishes the figures that lend it human interest. Without over-idealization she contrives to cast a halo of poetic charm over the lives of these rude semi-outlaws, while their very dialect, uncouth and almost unintelligible as it is, has a strange fascination for the reader. From their ranks too she has drawn two of the most pathetic female types in the pages of fiction, since Dorinda Cayce and Alethea Sayles are worthy to stand beside Jeanie Deans in their simple peasant dignity and unflinching rectitude of judgment. The plot of the author's present work turns on the adventures of Mink Lorey, a wild and wayward young mountaineer, little deserving of the heroine's exalted devotion and fidelity. His troubles, indeed, despite their disastrous ending, are due rather to reckless freakishness of nature than deliberate malice, though it must be confessed that an occasional dose of "bresh-whiskey," as the product of the illicit stills is called, has its full share in producing them. The author gives a lofty and tragic nobility to the fate of this seemingly worthless creature by allotting to him the crowning redemption of death in an act of self-sacrifice. Moved by an illogical but not unnatural impulse of humanity, he goes at the peril of his newly regained liberty to seek aid for a half-drowned man, a moment before the object of his jealous hate and fury, whom indeed he had come out with the deliberate purpose of slaying. Though an accidental death overtakes him on the way, he lives to achieve his errand of mercy, and save the life of his former enemy. Thus Alethea's love is justified, and a life that gave little promise is ennobled by an heroic end. The interest of the narrative culminates in the trial of Mink for a death unconsciously caused by him in a mischievous frolic. The scene in the court-house of Shaftesville is a masterpiece of imaginative realism, relieved by keen touches of humorous description, and touched with tenderest poetic grace by the exquisite picture of the baby-girl brought in to draw the names of the jury. In her child studies indeed the author recalls Victor Hugo, but while his are rather idealized abstractions of infancy, those of the American novelist are individual types as strongly marked as the grown-up personages of her story. We use

the pronoun advisedly, for on the title-page of her present work she allows her alias to be penetrated by adding her real name of Mary Murfree to the assumed one of Egbert Craddock. Among female novelists she may take rank with the very highest, while her youth gives promise of still further development of her powers.

A Son of Hagar. By HALL CAINE. London :
Chatto & Windus. 1887.

THE reputation gained by the author of "The Shadow of a Crime" will not be enhanced by his present work. In this he has scarcely attempted to give the semblance of coherence to a wildly improbable plot, starting from a tangle of doubtful genealogies, in which the complications of Irish and Scotch marriages and semi-marriages end by leaving the reader uncertain as to the real parentage of any of the personages. Owing to these obscure relationships, one half-brother is enabled to personate another so as to take possession of his property, and even claim that of his wife, while the real owner is expiating, as a convict at Portland, the crime committed by his double. The repentance and confession of a third brother, who had brought about this ingenious substitution from motives of revenge and jealousy, finally restore matters to an equitable footing and enable virtue to triumph duly in the third volume to the acclamations of feasting rustics and the chimes of village joy-bells.

Jess. By H. RIDER HAGGARD. London :
Smith, Elder & Co. 1887.

THIS is a stirring tale of romance and adventure in the Transvaal, the incidents of which are furnished by the successful rising of the Boers against their English rulers. The sufferings and humiliations of the loyalists are described in harrowing detail, and on them the plot is mainly made to hinge. In the drawing of character there is a tendency to exaggerate the darker traits, and the unredeemed blackness of the Boer villain wants some finer gradations of light and shade to make it seem true to nature. The end of the hapless heroine, too, is a climax of horror, constituting a violation of taste and even of morality, and leaving, in its suggestion of ghastly ferocity, a painful and inartistic impression on the reader's mind.

Springhaven. By R. D. BLACKMORE. London :
Sampson Low & Co. 1887.

THE author of "Lorna Doone" gives us in these volumes one of his quaint old-world tales of rustic life in remote districts. Its scene is laid in Springhaven, a port in Sussex, during the stirring times of expectancy and preparation, when Napoleon from his camp

at Boulogne held the menace of invasion suspended over the opposite shores of England. With this national crisis the fortunes of the characters are all bound up, and the stir and thrill of the impending danger working among the various classes of coast dwellers are vividly realized. There is, however, little coherence or probability in the series of incidents grafted on this heroic theme, and the characters fail to impress us with a sense of individuality. The heroine is little worthy of her position, for she is a frivolous coquette, who betrays the official secrets of her father, the admiral in command of the coast defences, to a French spy, and eventually causes his death by introducing this traitor into his house. We have incidental sketches both of Nelson and Napoleon, and the semi-seafaring story closes appropriately with the naval Waterloo, the battle of Trafalgar.

Lazarus in London. By F. W. ROBINSON. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1886.

MR. ROBINSON has laid the scene of his original and interesting novel among the struggling population of London, as is implied in its title. The centre of action is a poor and disreputable street in the purlieus of Soho, where three girls, fallen from better fortunes, try to earn a pittance by needlework combined with the profits of an obscure haberdasher's shop. Lydia, the elder, has sacrificed her own prospects of happiness to the duty bequeathed to her by her dying mother, of tending and caring for her two young step-sisters, Ella and Maud, who, with the ingratitude of youth, have little sympathy or affection for the staid monitress, so loyally devoted to them. Her story and character are full of that pathos which the poetical faculty can show underlying the most homely existence. The father of the heroines, by name William Prothero, a broken-down City merchant, now living as a pensioner in an almshouse, throws a dark shadow over their lives by his mysterious conduct in connection with the murder of his former partner, against whom he entertained a bitter grudge. His semi-craziness is vividly portrayed, and gives a lurid interest to the development of his character in the events of the narrative. The latter turns on the tracking out of the murder, the secret of which, involving the imprisonment and accusation of the hero, is ingeniously kept until the close. Sal Garboush, the drunken street-vagrant, with occasionally touches of womanly feeling redeeming her coarse and brutalized exterior, is a vigorous portrait of the realistic school, and the squalid misery of her father's death-bed could doubtless be matched in many actual scenes of London life.

The Story of an African Farm. By RALPH IRON (Olive Schreiner). New Edition. London: Chapman & Hall. 1887.

IN its appearance in a second edition this novel has received the stamp of success, and it has undoubted power, though of a somewhat morbid and gruesome character. There is a large admixture of

introspective philosophy, which seems to be Agnostic or semi-Agnostic as far as it is intelligible, and its pages are coloured with the dreary pessimism characteristic of modern thought. The heroine's conversation and conduct imply a negation of all morality, and the lingering tortures of her end are unredeemed by a ray of hope for the future. The story nevertheless, despite these faults, is interesting, even where unnatural, and the incongruous setting of South African settler-life rather heightens the effect of the strange, highly-pitched intellectual aspirations of the principal personages. The secondary sketches of Dutch manners are full of quaint humour, and we feel that the Boer courtship and wedding with their prosaic homeliness are drawn from life.

Dawn. By H. RIDER HAGGARD. London: John & Robert Maxwell.

THE title-page of this novel bears no date, and though advertised among new works, it would seem on internal evidence to be of earlier composition than the recent writings of the author. In regard of probability or motive of the action, it belongs indeed rather to the "penny dreadful" school of fiction, and resembles the tales published in the cheaper serials of this class, in its jumble of sensational incidents, without adequate leverage of force in the characters portrayed to set the machinery of the plot in motion. Some of the incidents and situations ought also on moral grounds to have been omitted, and, as it is scarcely likely to appear in an expurgated edition, it had better be avoided altogether.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

FRENCH PERIODICALS.

Revue des Questions Historiques. Janvier, 1887. Paris.

The Empire and the Church in the Reign of Gallienus.—Under this title M. Paul Allard writes an article which will prove as interesting to the secular as to the Church historian. The reign of Gallienus, he says, marks one of the most important moments in the political as well as the religious history of the third century. Gallienus began to exercise real power in the West A.D. 258; it was the moment of great invasions menacing the existence of the Empire. He repaired, indeed, the most serious fault of his father, and suppressed the persecution of the Christians, but showed himself less of a sound politician on another point: instead of encouraging

concentration against the barbarians he used his life and strength in conflict with his colleagues in East and West. His was a singular, interesting reign; it saw by anticipation the figures of those great movements which re-appeared later and filled the world's stage—as, e.g., the division of the Empire, which was a prelude of that realized thirty years later under Diocletian; religious peace, fifty years before Constantine; barbarian inroads in East and West, forecasts of the coming cataclysm that transformed Europe in the fifth and sixth centuries, and destroyed Roman Asia in the seventh. And under Gallienus none of these events produced their full effect; all remained incomplete. Yet, crowded on one another into the brief space of ten years, they offer a moving spectacle. They manifest in advance the causes of weakness of the Empire, they point already to the remedies that might yet have been applied. Such is the rapid sketch of the period here treated in a lengthened article, a period which M. Allard considers is too little studied. He traces the condition of the State in Italy and the Central Empire, the value and actuality of the peace granted by the Emperor to the Christians and the influence of his wife in their behalf; next, the condition of the East and how far there the Christians suffered the influence of Zenobia; then, lastly, the condition of Gaul, and the relations of State to the Christian society in Gaul, Britain, and Spain. In the central provinces the edict of Gallienus brought peace, but not absolutely everywhere; the weak character of the Emperor could not secure it in distant regions, where in one place perhaps it was flagrantly infringed, and in another scarcely respected in the letter, whilst violated in spirit where rulers hated the Christian religion. In the East persecution was open and bitter. In Gaul the Christians lived tranquilly. M. Allard considers that history has judged the character of Gallienus severely as to his incoherence, tyranny, and softness, and has not sufficiently reproached him for his greatest error—refusing to see the necessity, both political and military, of the two Empires founded in the East and West of the Roman world: *en revanche* he gave peace to the Christians under his rule: a peace which unfortunately did not endure; to establish it permanently demanded a firmer hand than his.

In the same number of the *Revue* M. Fustel des Coulanges has, under the title “De l'Analyse des Textes Historiques,” a severe criticism of M. Monod for his reading into the text of Gregory of Tours, by way of pretended analysis, Tacitus, the Salic law, and what not, with results as unjust to Gregory as unfair and misleading. M. Alfred Brandrillart has a paper, very interesting to students of French history, on “The Pretensions of Philip V. to the Throne of France,” which is entirely based on unedited documents; M. L. Pingaud writes, also instructively, on “Le Commerce du Levant sous Louis XVI.,” and, lastly, we may mention a very useful, analytical account of M. l'Abbé Duchesne's new edition of the “*Liber Pontificalis*,” from the pen of M. Paul Fournier.

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

By Canon BELLESHEIM, Aachen.

1. *Katholik.*

The Year of SS. Peter and Paul's Death.—Dr. Kellner, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Bonn, contributes to the January and February numbers two thoughtful papers on this intricate question. The prince of the Apostles, it is generally said, shed his blood for the faith, together with S. Paul, at Rome, on the 29th of June, A.D. 67. The first question to be met, on this important point, is: What say the historical documents? And in his first article Dr. Kellner is mainly occupied in gathering together from the most ancient authors of Christian antiquity whatever seems to bear thereupon. These number no less than forty-two; and we shall not attempt to reproduce them here. We will only mention, in passing, that both Furius D. Philocalus, secretary to Pope Damasus, and St. Leo the Great in his *Sacramentarium* (Migne, t. 55, col. 60), assign the death of St. Peter and St. Paul to the same day, but of different years. St. Augustine does the same (Migne, Op. S. Aug. iii. 1049, v. 1683). The result of Dr. Kellner's solid articles may be thus summed up:—1. The two Apostles were martyred on the same day of the month. 2. But not in the same year, since St. Peter died in Rome, his episcopal city, June 29, A.D. 55. 3. Hence, the years of his apostolate amount to 25. 4. It was likewise in Rome that S. Paul died, but two years later than S. Peter—viz., on June 29, A.D. 57. That the tradition of later centuries could have arisen and been accepted can be due only to a confusion of these dates supported by the most ancient authorities.

Dr. Schmitz contributes two rather lengthy articles, "On the Sixth Canon of the First General Council of Nicea, A.D. 325, and the Gallican Church." "On the Causes of Unbelief in Our Time" is the title of a suggestive paper from the pen of a bishop, who does not give his name. Let me call the attention of Christian artists in England to a very able and carefully done pamphlet, just issued by Dr. Reichensperger, on the eminent painter Edward von Steinle, who died in Frankfort last year. He and Herr von Führich may be styled most faithful scholars of Overbeck; and typical representatives of the revival of Christian art in the nineteenth century.

2. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach.*

Buddha's Opinions on God, the Soul, and Immortality.—Father Christian Pesch follows up his suggestive papers on Buddha's religious opinions, and, in this article, brings out the striking difference between Christianity and Buddhism. Indeed, an unprejudiced reader after perusing this paper will readily accept the author's conclusion: that the Oriental philosophy, whose exponent

appears in Buddha, is the very denial of what God, the soul, and immortality mean to a Christian mind.

Father Kneller starts a series of articles on the two first persecutions of Christians, and in the first one puts aside the two very divergent opinions nowadays held concerning them by German, French, and Italian archaeologists. A contribution dwelling on Irish affairs by Father Zimmermann (who is familiar with all questions regarding Irish Catholics) will not fail to attract the attention of wide circles in Catholic Germany. Basing his remarks on Mr. R. Barry O'Brien's work, "Fifty Years of Concession to Ireland," he very ably traces the history of those both unjust and abortive exertions of the Irish Established Church to force an anti-Catholic education on Catholic Ireland. It is only to be regretted that the author did not set himself to describe the present state of higher education in Ireland. Notwithstanding numerous concessions, Irish Catholics are still far from being on an equality with Protestants in the department of University education. Father Baumgartner is always brilliant. Last year, to recruit his health, he went to Norway, and to this excursion we owe the article headed "The Hanse-town Bergen in Norway," which, for its style and matter, has already attracted general attention. In this he is not only a brilliant prose writer, but shows his claim to be reputed a poet by his most successful translation of Swedish poems into German. Father von Hammerstein wages war on "Modern Ideas of State and School," whilst Father Lehmkuhl inveighs against the barbarous custom of duelling.

3. *Historisch-politische Blätter.*

"**Ireland and England**" is the heading of a paper in the January number, contributed by a German priest living in Ireland. Next follows a general survey of the books, papers, and pamphlets, all but innumerable, which have appeared on the anniversary of Heidelberg University. The brilliant volume brought out by the Hungarian bishops, under the title "*Monumenta Vaticana. Relationes Cardinalis Buonvisi,*" deserves mention. It contains the despatches sent from Vienna to Rome in 1686, and received from thence by Cardinal Buonvisi, Nuncio at that time at the Emperor's Court. The defeat of the Turks in 1686 in the Hungarian capital, the second centenary of which was celebrated last year, never could have been achieved by the Emperor Leopold I. without the constant subsidies of Innocent XI. and the energy manifested by the sagacious and indefatigable Nuncio, who supported the Emperor's waning courage, and traced the course to be followed in Hungary. Father Stevenson's able book on "The First Eighteen Years of Mary Queen of Scots" seemed to me too important a vindication of the honour of the unjustly calumniated Princess to be passed over without a somewhat lengthened notice; and I was happy to contribute it to the February number, appropriately, too, for the third centenary of the Queen's glorious death.

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Civiltà Cattolica, 1 Gennaio, 1887.

Hypnotism.—The interesting series of articles on Hypnotism have been continued. In the number for January 1, of this year, the reviewer applies the Christian theory, in the light of which the more advanced stages of mesmerism have been already regarded by him, to the more restricted sphere of hypnotism, at least to that to which it pretends to confine itself—viz., as it supposes, the sphere of the natural and physical powers. Concerning the former—namely, transcendental mesmerism—there can, as he has proved, be no doubt of the intervention of diabolical agency. He has applied to its manifestations the criteria laid down by Catholic theologians in judging such questions, and he is prepared to adopt the same test with reference to hypnotism, and to make it clear that its apparently most inexplicable facts are to be fully explained by the presence of Satanic influence. Some men think it strange that in Christian times the devil should have so much freedom to mix himself in human society. But the wonder ceases when we remember the power which Satan naturally possesses over pagans. Now, pagans abound at this day in the bosom of Christianity, or rather unbelievers and apostates worse than pagans, to whom must be added a still larger number of Christians sunk in indifference, and more or less culpably ignorant, who in no way shrink from contact with infernal influences. Satan wants to recover the sovereignty of the world. He will not succeed, for the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, but nothing hinders him from setting up a little India in Paris, London, or Florence. The reviewer tells us that already a society adoring “Giovè Ottimo Massimo” has been founded in Italy. This he learned from a gentleman, a distinguished writer, who had been requested to give the support of his name. In a village where masonic civilization flourishes, a good number of persons had also been induced to join in worshipping the sun. It is a well-known fact, moreover, that in certain assemblies of the initiated, Satan is adored with impious rites and sacrifices. It was only the other day that the Masons even made bold to invite the public to the Gerbino Theatre, to hear and applaud Carducci’s hymn to Satan. Others are surprised that the devil should make such an open show of his power in hospitals and in public assemblies; heretofore he has jealously concealed his machinations. But such concealment has existed only where his instruments have been watched and punished; where he is honoured he is glad to come forward and display himself. Under masonic rule he can do as he pleases, so it is only natural that he should give free scope to his hatred of God or man in public, just saving appearances, in order not to alarm the conscience of the people, who are better than their rulers. .

The reviewer proceeds to show the new light which Christian science throws on those strange phenomena of hypnotism which

natural science is powerless to explain; as, for instance, how an eye fixed on the eye of another is sufficient instantaneously to produce in a perfectly healthy man a host of morbid and marvellous phenomena, or, instead of the fixed eye, the ticking of a clock, the looking at a shining object, the sprinkling of a little water, or the simple command "Sleep"—anything, in fact, at the choice of the operator. But all these absurdities, inexplicable as efficient causes by physiological science, become intelligible to one who is conversant with demonology, and who recognizes in these tokens, however ridiculous, the conventional sign of diabolical influence of which the reviewer spoke at length in a previous article. At the concerted signal the devil fulfils the *pact*, as St. Thomas calls it, or the *contract* as St. Augustine has it, in which view all Catholic theologians coincide. Nothing can be easier to Satan, with his natural angelic powers, of which he has not been deprived, than to produce through the action of physical causes, when he is not divinely hindered, the mesmeric sleep at any given moment, with all its accompaniments. But it will be said, when was this pact made, since neither the hypnotizer nor the hypnotized ever thought of dealing with the devil? All doctors, however, agree that this pact need not be explicit or express. It is sufficient that it should be tacit, and, in fact, there is a tacit agreement when the hypnotizer demands of what in itself is an impotent cause, such as a look or a word, a revolution in the whole hygienic condition of a human body. It is clear that he believes in and virtually invokes the intervention of some agency capable of producing these preternatural effects. It was thus in pagan times that auguries and omens were invoked by sacrificial rites. We are not, however, to suppose that all are equally guilty in these acts; human ignorance and inadvertence are extraordinary. Thus, simple people will go on using a sign for some medical or other purpose, and by God's permission will even obtain what they seek, with little, or perhaps, through their extreme ignorance, no personal guilt. We have not infrequent examples of this in the practice of many popular superstitions.

If the poor doctors would candidly confess it, they must be utterly bewildered by the hypnotic manifestations which they are called to witness, manifestations produced by the sole power of the operator's will, and, as has been abundantly proved, even at a distance. It is all very well to talk of suggestion and predisposition, but these are mere words, themselves needing explanation. Moreover, how can any medical man explain, not only the instantaneous production of these states, but the deliverance of the hypnotised in the midst of their paroxysms by a mere puff in the face? What malady was ever so cured? And how explain after such paroxysms the entire absence of a stage of convalescence?—a circumstance, be it added, in no way embarrassing to the Catholic theologian, well acquainted with the usually temporary effects of the most violent obsessions. As for the sight of covered objects on the vision of them through opaque bodies, or, again, the so-called transposition of the senses, to account for

which the hypnotists are driven to have recourse to the most absurd theories, they offer no difficulty to the Christian scientist; as it is easy for the devil to produce the same impression on the retina as would the visible object if presented to it, or make a person believe he sees by his occiput, not his eyes. The same is true with respect to the sight of distant objects, the speaking with unknown tongues, and the like. "*Signa autem obsidentis dæmonis sunt, ignota lingua loqui pluribus verbis, vel loquentem intelligere, distantia et occulta patefacere, et id genus alia.*"* We refer the reader to the article itself, where the reviewer follows out the parallel, and answers all the various objections which may be raised.

This is a grave practical question for those who believe they can keep within lawful bounds by limiting themselves to the sphere to which hypnotists affect to confine themselves. It must be remembered that it is entirely at the operator's choice what manifestations he may please to evolve. If he choose to stop short of what has been styled by distinction the transcendental, it is not because there is any definite line of demarcation between the less striking effects of mesmerism and those which bear a more marked preternatural stamp—in other words, betray the intervention of an invisible power, which in this case can only be that of the devil.

Notices of Books.

History of the Papacy during the Reformation. By Prof. M. CREIGHTON.
Four Vols. London: Longmans & Co.

PROFESSOR CREIGHTON'S work is the fairest and most solid history of the Mediæval Church that we have yet seen, from any hand that is not Catholic. We make this reserve, because, in the commendation that we may give, it is always necessary to bear in mind that a Catholic hand would not have written many things that are contained in it. Nevertheless, it fulfils in a remarkable degree the profession which the author makes in the preface to his third volume, where he writes as follows: "If the writers of the Middle Ages are to be reduced to the scientific view of historical progress which we now adopt, the same treatment ought in all fairness to be applied to the literary men of the Renaissance. The credulity displayed in the gossip of the one has to be appraised as carefully as the credulity of the miraculous records of the others. I have attempted to found a sober view of the time on a sober criticism

* See Ritual. Rom. in its Introduction to Exorcisms.

of its authorities." The author has been faithful to this engagement, and the book is marked by research of original documents, by accuracy in dealing with ecclesiastical matters, and by a calm judicial discernment.

The title given to the book is narrower than its contents; for it begins as early as the great Western Schism, before as yet the Reformation, as commonly understood, had arisen. Nevertheless, it is true that long before that period a clamour for Reformation in "head and members" had long been heard. The title may, therefore, be justified in this sense; and it is certain that the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel were the forerunners of the Council of Trent, down to which Professor Creighton intends to continue his work; as also that the Renaissance, and all the flood of intellectual and moral evil which deluged Italy and infected Rome, was the prelude of the Lutheran Reformation. In this sense, therefore, the title may be justified, for it contains the two-fold Reformation, legitimate and illegitimate, Catholic and anti-Catholic, Constructive and Destructive, the one which was wrought by the Church, reforming itself from within, the other, which, in attempting to reform the Church from without, has ended in confusion. No doubt the learned author when he treats of the Council of Trent will not fail to observe that of almost every session of the Council, twenty-five in number, a large part is headed "De Reformatione;" nor will he fail to appreciate the profound and world-wide Reformation which the Council of Trent has wrought in the last three centuries. In the preface to the first volume, the author says: "I have taken the history of the Papacy as the central point for my investigation, because it gives the largest opportunity for a survey of European affairs as a whole." This mode of procedure shows a true discernment; for, as Donoso Cortes affirmed: "The history of civilization is the history of Christianity, and the history of Christianity is the history of the Catholic Church, and the history of the Catholic Church is the history of the Pontiffs, the greatest lawgivers and rulers of the Christian world." In the introduction to the first volume, the author treats of the rise of the Papal power, and in his mode of treatment follows the same line as Mr. Bryce in his book on the Holy Roman Empire. Both these learned authors occupy themselves with tracing out the external, secondary and human events which led to the formation of the Papal power and the Holy Roman Empire. But in neither is there a recognition of the primary and vital force from which these two creations sprang. The Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, apart from the Divine Institution of the Catholic Church, would be merely external and human organizations. No human intelligence or power can adequately account for them. They were both living systems, the Church having life in itself, and the Empire having life from and of the Church, and enduring so long as it was faithful to the principle from which it sprang. *Omne vivum a vivo*, and nothing is sustained but by the principle from which it springs. Professor Creighton seems at least to recognize these primary laws. He says: "The theory

of the Papal Monarchy over the Church was not the result merely of grasping ambition and intrigue on the part of individual Popes; it corresponded rather to the deep-seated belief of Western Christendom" (vol. i. page 12). It is not without surprise, therefore, that we read that the forged Decretals "form the legal basis of the Papal Monarchy;" and "the importance of the forgery lay in the fact that it represented the ideal of the future as a fact of the past, and displayed the Papal Primacy as an original institution of the Church of Christ." Nevertheless, he adds: "The Papacy did not originate this forgery; but it made haste to use it." But how should the forgery have deceived anybody, if it had not in the main closely corresponded with the facts before the eyes of men? A bank-note may be forged, but it proves the existing currency of bank-notes, and could deceive nobody if it did not minutely correspond with the genuine bank-note. The truth is, that the forged Decretals, except in subordinate details of ecclesiastical procedure, truly reflect the Divine primacy which was the deep-seated belief of Western Christendom—that is, of the Catholic world. After Tertullian had become Montanist, he assailed the Bishop of Rome as "Pontifex Maximus, issuing peremptory decrees;" but these words would have had neither point nor meaning if the visible primacy of the Bishop of Rome had not corresponded with them.

The divisions of the whole work, as far as it has yet advanced, would appear to be as follows: First, The Great Schism; from the year 1378 to 1414. Before this period the unity of the Empire of Charlemagne had been broken up into separate States, and the spirit of Nationalism had profoundly divided the Cardinals and the local Churches. Nothing can more clearly demonstrate the divine unity of the Church than its survival and its restoration of itself out of the conflict of national schisms. The impotence of individuals to break up the unity of the Church had been long ago demonstrated, and now the impotence even of nations was conspicuously demonstrated in this period of the Great Schism. The unity of the Church reasserted itself in the Council of Constance, and nearly five centuries have passed in which the union of the Church with its head have been more than ever luminously manifested. The second period reaches from the Council of Constance in the year 1444 to 1464, which the author calls the Papal Restoration. During this period Constantinople fell under the power of the Turks. From that date the influx of Greeks and of Greek literature into Italy gave rise to the literary movement of the Renaissance. In treating of this subject the judicial fairness of the author is conspicuous, and affords a contrast with the learned but prejudiced volumes of Mr. Symonds. It must, however, in justice to Mr. Symonds, be said that he has faithfully and fully exhibited the inflated vain-glory, the morbid self-love, the childish petulance, the boundless licentiousness, and the virulent foulness of tongue of the Humanists. Professor Creighton gives a calm and tame description of the literary quarrel between Poggio and Valla. He says: "Not content with repelling Poggio's

attacks, or attacking his literary character, he cast aspersions on his private life. Poggio retorted by opening the flood-gates of abuse on Valla. Every scandalous story was raked up. Every possible villany was laid to his charge; nay, even a picture was drawn of the final judgment of the great day, and Valla was remorselessly condemned to perdition. . . . The contest was carried on by clothing the lowest scurrility with classical language." Poggio and Valla are fair samples of these literary duellists. Mr. Symonds's book is still more abundant in these literary quarrels, and his whole narrative shows that the effect, if not the aim, of the Humanists was to restore classical tastes, classical standards of thought and action, classical morality—in a word, pure paganism, to the derision and extinction of Christianity.

Mr. Symonds gives examples of their language as follows:—"God was *Jupiter Optimus Maximus*; Providence, *Fatum*; the Saints, *Divi*; their statues, *Simulacra Dei Sanctorum*; Our Lady of Loreto, *Dea Lauretana*; SS. Peter and Paul, *Dii tutelares Romæ*; the souls of the just, *Manes pii*; the Pope's excommunication, *diræ*; his tiara, *Infula Romulea*; the Seven Churches, *Septem Sacrasancta Divum pulvinaria*. Bembo advised Sadoletto to avoid the Epistles of St. Paul lest the barbarous Latinity should spoil his style.

Although Mr. Symonds describes so profusely the profound immorality of the Humanists, and affirms that the genius of the Renaissance followed the first Medicean Pope from Florence into Rome, nevertheless he fastens upon Rome and the Papacy the profuse immoralities which he describes, as if they were the up-growth of the Holy See, instead of the leprosy of the Renaissance itself. And yet he says that "the intrusion of the Humanists into the Papal Curia was a victory of the purely secular spirit." Professor Creighton is discerning enough to perceive that the infidelity and the immorality of the Humanists invaded Rome from without, and involved the Papacy from Sixtus IV. to Leo X. in every kind of accusation and dishonour. Mr. Symonds says that "bullying and fawning tainted the sources of history," and that "licentiousness became a special branch of humanistic literature. Under the thin mask of humane refinement leered the untamed savage." The profound corruption of manners, springing from this restored paganism, pervaded the whole mind of Italy with the foulest imaginations and darkest suspicions of all public personages, both men and women. There is no kind of domestic or private crime, from incest to poisonings, which was not imputed to them. The whole literary atmosphere was black with malevolent accusations. We can almost believe that we are reading the description of Rome in the sixth satire of Juvenal. One single example may be given—namely, Lucrezia Borgia. Mr. Symonds, with the full swing of Lord Macaulay's style, describes her as if she were Messalina. Professor Creighton, with the cautious judgment of an historian, shows his mistrust at such alleged enormities. Mr. Roscoe long ago pointed out that the first traces of these accusations appeared in the writings of certain Neapolitan poets, who were exasperated by

the policy of Alexander VI. He says that they would scarcely have deserved a serious reply if Guicciardini had not reproduced them as "rumours." From that time Catholic writers have repeated them, and Protestant controversialists have revelled in them. But, as Mr. Roscoe has pointed out, they are not only incredible from their enormity, but Lucrezia Borgia was received by marriage into the illustrious family of Este as Duchess of Ferrara, an event morally impossible if her life had been so deeply stained and so publicly infamous. Contemporaneous writers, such as Giralaldi, Libanori, Caviceo, and many others describe her as of uncommon excellence, virtuous, and modest. And the unanimous testimony of history is that for twenty years her life as Duchess of Ferrara was conspicuous in blameless dignity. It may be well here to remember two examples in our own history. Protestant writers have described Ann Boleyn as a paragon of virtue and religion, Catholic writers have laid to her charge crimes too black to repeat. Her latest biographer, Paul Friedmann, with all these contradictions before him, and with the advantage of later and more authentic documents, does not, indeed, clear her fame, but rejects the darkest imputations under which she died. Again, if we are to believe Scottish historians, Mary Queen of Scots was guilty of profligacy and complicity in the murder of her husband. Every successive historian of later date, with the continual accession of new documents and of fuller evidence, has cleared her name, not, perhaps, of all early levity, but of these foulest charges. We have reason, therefore, to believe that when the history of the Papacy before the Lutheran Revolt shall be re-written, in the growing light of additional documents and fuller evidence, much that even Professor Creighton has allowed to stand in his pages will be cleared away. Certain it is that the succession of Pontiffs described by Ranke stands in such abrupt and singular contrast with those that went immediately before them as to render much that we read of the Popes in the fifteenth century improbable, if not incredible. It was the fashion of Protestant controversialists to hold up a list of more than thirty Popes whom they would have the world believe to be heretics or of unsound doctrine. As time went on one after another disappeared from this list, until it was reduced to two only, Liberius and Honorius. Against Liberius no heterodoxy can be alleged. Against Honorius no allegation was made until forty years after his death, in the beginnings of the Greek Schism. We have reason, therefore, to believe that the course of history in the future will cleanse many a great name. Nevertheless, in the meantime, it is enough for us to remember that Caiaphas was high priest and that Judas was an apostle.

A third period, according to Professor Creighton, dates from the Pontificate of Sixtus IV., at which time the Papacy engaged itself in the politics of Italy by diplomacy and by war. In his judgment Sixtus IV. began the secularization of the Papacy. "From that time onward," he says, "the Pontiffs became Italian princes, and by the enrichment of their kinsmen became the founders of the Papal families

which exist to this day." The fourth volume closes with the pontificate of Leo X. and the Lateran Council of 1520.

Professor Creighton laid down for himself the duty of founding a sober view of the credulity and gossip of those ages on a sober criticism of authorities, a duty of absolute obligation for any historian who desires to ascertain the truth rather than to indulge his prejudices. There has been no great personality in any age of the Church of whom two characters have not been recorded by contemporary writers. The divine Head of the Church prepared all his vicars upon earth to expect such treatment, when he said, "the disciple is not above his Master." He was denounced as a deceiver, a pretender, and a demoniac. His vicars have been baptized with His baptism.

If we are to believe the narrative of Ferretus, we should believe Boniface VIII. to be what Dante was deceived into believing, but Muratori has proved its mendacity; nevertheless, Sismondi reproduces it. In the tenth century Liutprand so blackens his adversaries, including the Pontiffs, that his calumnies would have passed undetected if Flodoard had not written at the same time. We may take as illustration two modern examples: the character of St. Thomas of Canterbury as defaced by Mr. Froude and as drawn by Mr. Freeman; and, again, the character of Henry VIII. in Mr. Froude's "History of England," and the Henry VIII. presented by Paul Friedmann in his "History of Anne Boleyn." These examples are enough to put us on our guard against the studied accusations of partisans, and the credulous gossip of the world. Professor Creighton has weighed in the balance the conflicting evidence of such pontificates as those of Innocent VIII., Alexander VI., and Leo X., observing carefully the rule he prescribed for himself, "a rumour gains nothing in credibility by repetition; the question must always be what is the evidence of it." The following passage is a sample of his candour:—

Spain was aggrieved at the reception into the Papal States of the refugee Jews or Moors, who were driven from Spain by the stringency of the Inquisition. Spaniards, in the assertion of their nationality, were desirous to rid themselves of all foreign elements, and employed the Inquisition for that purpose. The crowds of luckless *Marrani*, as they were called, awakened the compassion of the Italians, who saw them arrive on their coasts, and many of them came to Rome, where they were subjected to no persecution. A crowd encamped outside the Appian Gate, and were the means of bringing an outbreak of plague into the city. The Papal tolerance was displeasing to the Spanish rulers, and the ambassador expressed his wonder that the Pope, who was the head of the Christian faith, should receive into his city those who had been driven from Spain as the enemies of the Christian faith. We do not find that Alexander VI. paid much heed to these remonstrances; the Papacy in its spirit of tolerance was far in advance of public opinion.

To this passage is added the following note:—

Writers who themselves regard toleration as a virtue, sneer at the Papal treatment of Prince Djem and the Marrani as proofs of Papal intolerance.

difference to religion, following in this Infessura. I do not consider this fair, as the Papacy in the Middle Ages always showed a tolerant spirit in matters of opinion.

The following words describe the death of S. Catherine of Siena :—

The legend goes on to say that some of those who called on Catherine of Siena were miraculously released. It was the last miracle wrought by Catherine in the flesh, as she died on April 29, 1380. In the dismal history of these gloomy times she presents a picture of purity, devotion, and self-sacrifice to which we turn with feelings of relief. In her intense and passionate desire for personal communion with Jesus, Catherine resembles the fervent nature of St. Francis of Assisi, but her lot was cast in times when zeal had grown cold in high places, and she spent her energy in agonized attempts to heal the breaches of the Papal system. A simple maiden of Siena, she ventured in her Master's name to try and redress the evils which were so open and avowed. She saw Italy widowed of its Pope; she saw the Church venal and corrupt; and, though she was inspired by mystic enthusiasm, she worked with practical force and courage to restore the Papacy to Italy and inaugurate an era of reform. In urgent tones she summoned the Popes from Avignon, and Urban V. answered to her call. She went from city to city pleading for peace, and in the discharge of her mission shrank neither from the fierce brawls of civic passion nor the coarse brutality of the condottiere camp. Before her eyes floated the vision of a purified and reformed Church, of which the restoration of the Papacy to its original seat was to be at once the symbol and the beginning. Blinded by her enthusiasm, she hailed with delight the accession of Urban VI., and by the side of the violent and vindictive Pope her pure and gentle spirit seems to stand as an angel of light. She did not long survive the disappointment of the Schism, and though she remained constant in her allegiance to Urban VI., his character and actions must have been a perpetual trial to her faith. She died at the age of thirty-three, and the removal of her influence for mercy is seen in the increased vindictiveness of Urban's measures. Canonized by Pius II., Catherine of Siena has a claim upon our reverence higher than that of a saint of the Mediæval Church. A low-born maiden, without education or culture, she gave the only possible expression in her age and generation to the aspiration for national unity and for the restoration of ecclesiastical purity (vol. i. pp. 70, 71).

Every Catholic in reading this beautiful passage will desire that Professor Creighton may some day correct it with a Catholic hand.

The history traced in these four volumes shows with what relentless storm the gates of hell have beat against the rock of Peter. The prophecy is twofold, first that they shall never prevail, but secondly they shall never cease to storm against it. In the long history of the Church from the day when Peter descended from the guest-chamber to preach his Master's name, a continuous and ever-changing warfare of every kind of human perversity and preternatural deceit has striven against the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Centuries of martyrdom, heresy, schism, barbarian hordes, Imperial tyranny, and, more dangerous, Imperial favour, the revolt of nations, the rising again of paganism, the flood of all refined and gross immorality, the pride and perversity of intellect, the gnosticism of private judgment, the revival of persecution unto blood, wars, captivities, revolutions,

and the usurpation of Rome itself have never prevailed against the imperishable See of Peter. It is more majestic at this day in its world-wide authority and its infallible voice, in the unity of the Episcopate in itself and with its head, and in the loving obedience of the universal flock, than at any time since the Prince of the Apostles was crucified in the gardens of Nero.

HENRY EDWARD, CARD. ARCHBISHOP.

-
1. *Life of Saint Cuthbert.* By the Right Rev. EDWARD CONSITT. London : Burns & Oates. 1887.
 2. *The Life of St. Cuthbert.* By the VENERABLE BEDE. Translated from the original Latin by the Rev. JOSEPH STEVENSON, S.J. London : Burns & Oates. 1887.

THESE two publications, both of them of great interest and importance, have been called forth by the celebration of the twelfth centenary of the death of St. Cuthbert, which occurs this year, and which has already been kept with much solemnity on the 20th of March. Hitherto the only accessible life of the great Patron of Northumbria has been the elaborate work of the Archbishop of Glasgow. Provost Consitt, who at the present moment worthily represents as Vicar Capitular the see and the patrimony of St. Cuthbert, and has naturally, since the lamented death of Bishop Bewick, placed himself at the head of the devout priests and laity who wish to honour the centenary, has here undertaken to supply a want which many, no doubt, have felt—a life of the Patron of the diocese in a popular form and at a moderate cost. Bishop Bewick, who had a singular devotion to the local Saints of the North, and who, had he lived, would have spared no pains to make this centenary a success, seems to have inspired both this “popular” life, and the translation of Venerable Bede. Provost Consitt has all the gifts of a popular writer—enthusiasm for his subject, a most complete grasp of details, and an easy and winning style. In forty-one chapters he recounts the facts of the Saint’s life, from his boyhood on the banks of the Tweed to his death in the hermitage at Farne. Following mainly the narrative of Venerable Bede, he supplements it with the valuable additions of the anonymous Lindisfarne writer and of Bede’s own Church History. He also adds many useful notes, whilst the topographical details inserted in the text are the result of a first-hand acquaintance with the scene of St. Cuthbert’s life and labours. The whole work breathes piety, faith, and Catholic spirit, and it will form a treasured addition to those volumes of devotional reading which are coming into increasing demand among English-speaking Catholics. Provost Consitt’s description of the various translations or disinterments of the body of St. Cuthbert is very full and striking. Many will regret that he abandons the tradition that the incorrupt body of the Saint is still preserved in a

secret place in Durham Cathedral. It must be admitted that there is no accessible evidence of a matter which, of necessity, can never be tested until the Cathedral becomes once more Catholic. But the tradition certainly does exist. It can be traced to within about a hundred years after the desecration of the tomb by Henry VIII.'s visitors. What is called the "secular" tradition may perhaps have been disposed of. But the examination made by Dean Waddington in the presence of Provost Consitt himself—(the date is not given)—when the steps of the "clock-tower" were removed, by no means exhausts the possibility of the existence of the incorrupt body. The hypothesis which the Provost seems disposed to adopt—that the body, which was undoubtedly incorrupt at the time of the desecration under Henry VIII., had become a skeleton by the year 1828, seems more improbable than the tradition itself. Archbishop Eyre positively states that the condition of the coffin found in 1828 conclusively proves that no body could have ever decayed there; and indeed Canon Raine himself was the first to assert this.

Father Stevenson's translation is admirable, and his too scanty notes most welcome. The (prose) life of St. Cuthbert by Venerable Bede has evidently been modelled on the dialogues of St. Gregory, and on that Pope's life of St. Benedict. As an historical monument and a devout memorial of a wonderful Saint, it is equally valuable.

Dante's Divina Commedia: its Scope and Value. From the German of FRANZ HETTINGER, D.D., Professor of Theology at the University of Würzburg. Edited by HENRY SEBASTIAN BOWDEN, of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates. 1887.

THIS is a Catholic Commentary on a great Catholic poem, and we have to thank the Rev. Father Sebastian Bowden both for having had it translated into English and for the admirable introduction which he has himself prefixed to the volume. Commentaries on poems are apt to be dull and dry; the commentator generally considers he has done his duty when he repeats in lumbering prose what his author has expressed in verse. The Commentary of Dr. Hettinger on Dante does not, we are constrained to say, escape altogether this common fate. To explain the "*Divina Commedia*" is an enterprise, however, which is not without its justification. There is no doubt that the poet himself intended it to be, to a great extent, an allegory. It has many of the defects of an allegory: the allusions are too often obscure, the imagery grotesque, and the results such as would have been more impressive if stated without any allegorical apparatus at all. Luckily, Dante was a transcendent genius and a supreme poet, and he has almost neutralized the defects of his own plan. The intense personality which runs through the work gives it a kind of unity; we never lose sight of the stern-eyed poet and philosopher as he shows us his pictures of hell, or purgatory, or paradise. Then his incomparable gift of expression coins and

stamps the pictures of his vivid fancy into concrete, solid, coloured things, which hold the reader's attention as the earth, the sky, and the sea do. And the melody of his verse, so unique, so deep, and so surprising, defeats every suspicion of artifice or straining after effect, and completes that illusion—so necessary to make first-rate poetry—that the verse is the poet's natural song, unpremeditated as the morning hymn of the lark. But if Dante has written an allegorical poem, it was inevitable that Dante's commentators should fasten much more upon the allegory than the poetry. It is true that the great mediæval poet had the inestimable advantage of writing as a Catholic upon the deepest subjects of religion and Divine revelation. A Commentary on such a work as this must necessarily have an interest peculiar to itself. One cannot glance through the contents of Dr. Hettinger's book without observing the innumerable points in which the "*Divina Commedia*" touches on Catholic dogma and Catholic life—on the Holy Trinity, creation, the angels, the demons, man, the fall, the Incarnation, the Blessed Virgin, the Saints, the Holy Sacraments, and other subjects connected with the deepest interests of the human race. When we remember, moreover, the history of this grand poem, and its place in literature, we cannot be surprised that attempts should be made to explain and illustrate it by the work of the commentator. Its plan and scope, its allusions, its theories, its learning, and its truth—all these offer opportunities for the historian, the antiquary, and the apologist.

Father Bowden has written an introduction of some thirty pages, which he calls an "Editor's Preface." In the absence of anything more comprehensive, it might form by itself a very serviceable explanation of Dante's poem. The writer, among other things, enters somewhat fully into the subject of the poet's treatment of the Popes. It must always remain a problem why the clear-eyed poet and patriot so hotly took the part of the Emperor against the Pope. He must have known, and seen, that the freedom, the commerce, and the religion of the Italian cities and republics would have been quenched in an Oriental despotism over and over again if it had not been for the resistance offered by the Papacy to the German Emperors. Perhaps the true explanation lies in the fact that Dante's experience of the internal wars and feuds of Italy was so very strong and personal that he was forced to look about for some controlling power to quell them. He elaborated a theory that the Roman Empire was of Divine origin, and that every nation and State was by Divine right its subject and its vassal. He grounded this view on the strangest mixture of abstract philosophy and legendary fable; on the principles of Aristotle, the history of *Æneas*, and his story of the building of Rome. But it seems quite clear that his very strongest statement of the Divine rights of the Empire was never intended to interfere with the sovereign powers of individual nations or cities. And his only grounds of remonstrance against the Papacy were, first, that some of the Popes were inactive

or took part with France against the Emperor; and, secondly, that they were greedy of power and riches—an accusation which men in those days never scrupled, with all their Catholicism, to formulate in the strongest fashion whenever they saw fit. He did not approve of the civil principedom of the Holy See—that is, he expressed an opinion which in his day was probably rash, but was certainly not formally condemned. But he upholds in the strongest way the supremacy and independence of the Church, and the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power.

Dr. Hettinger's work, which the English editor tells us he has considerably abridged and has divided into new chapters, begins with an account of Dante's life and writings. The second chapter describes the idea and form of the great poem. The author is puzzled whether to call it an epic poem, or a drama, or a didactic poem; he decides it is none of them, nor all three combined; it is the "poetic encyclopædia of Western civilization" (p. 62). "It is the epic of humanity" (p. 16). Speaking of the wonderful *terza rima*, Dr. Hettinger says: "Dante starts from the principle that poetry is inseparable from song. Poetry is only an oratorical poem set to music. Each stanza is adapted to receive a certain tone. With him, verse is not poetry unless wedded to song" (pp. 62, 63). There is something strange about these sentences. Perhaps the translation misses some of the distinctive terms. If not, we can only say that the description of poetry as "an oratorical poem set to music" is rather new than satisfying, and that the author apparently wishes us to infer that the "*Divina Commedia*" was intended to be sung.

The "symbolism" of the poem is next explained in chapter iii. This is not very interesting, but was perhaps necessary. The worst of "interpreting" is that the interpreter is so sorely tempted to read into his author meanings which were never intended. We do not for a moment believe, for example, that the "*Vita Nuova*," the "*Convito*," and the "*Divina Commedia*" "form a trilogy which expresses Dante's spiritual development" (p. 84). Next follow three chapters, entitled respectively, "Hell," "Purgatory," and "Paradise," in which the commentator follows the course of the poem and explains the structure of the poet's earth and heavens, and the moral ideas which underlie his description of the realms beyond the grave. In three more chapters we have the exposition of Dante's theological views, especially on God, creation, redemption, and justification. The two final chapters are called respectively, "Dante and Reform" and "The Church and the Empire."

Throughout the work the poem is nowhere quoted in the original. Father Bowden has followed Cary's translation. A list of commentaries and translations is given (p. 100), but it is by no means as complete as could be wished. We miss Landino and Velutello; and surely "*Ottimo*" is not a man's name? "*Philalethes*" (King John of Saxony) is put among the commentators; but his translation is considered the best German translation which has appeared. The

Monte Cassino edition of 1865 is not mentioned. "Bargigi" is probably a printer's error for "Bagioli." Father Bowden tells us that thirty translations and twenty works on Dante have appeared in English during the present century. Of these writings not one is from the pen of a Catholic; and therefore, as he remarks, the publication of this English translation of Dr. Hettinger's essay seems scarcely to need an apology. In this sentiment we most heartily agree.

It should be added that the volume contains, besides a very full table of contents, a good verbal index. It is admirably printed and well got up.

The Life of Mother Henrietta Kerr, Religious of the Sacred Heart.
 Edited by JOHN MORRIS, S.J. Second Edition. With Two
 Portraits. Roehampton. 1887.

THE author of this biography has done her work in the right fashion. Instead of being at pains to point morals, or to adorn her tale with her own reflections, she has made her heroine as far as possible reveal herself in a series of bright letters, filling up the spaces with reports of conversations and the opinions of intimate friends. We remember once hearing the Master of Balliol contrasting Thucydides with Plutarch. The former, he said (with perhaps *une point de malice*), only cared for truth; the latter did not care a bit for truth, he only wanted to be *edifying*. Certainly the author of this *Life* wishes to be edifying; but, in her mind, edification is not divided against truth; in fact, she seems to think that truth is the shortest road to edification, and she has not shrunk from publishing the most familiar letters, in which Madame Kerr shows her heart and her mind with the most absolute unreserve. And no doubt the wise, who, as Plato says somewhere, "always want to be with those who are better than themselves," will feel it a privilege to be thus admitted to the intimacy of so gracious a personage.

What struck us most in her life was its selflessness. Ordinary unselfishness in society consists in preferring the love of those who surround us, to one's own comfort and convenience. Detachment even from the love of others is what few are capable of, even think of. We read of Madame Kerr that "she could only accept an affection which was spiritual, supernatural, and noble. She received it, sought it even, only to pass it on to God. What she could not pass on to Him could not touch her." This reminds us of another holy nun of our time, with whom Mother Kerr presents many points of contrast. When Mother Margaret lay dying, she protested to her children, "I never sought to win the affections of one of you. I never did that. I have not that to reproach myself with; infidelity to grace—that I have." Our Lord, as is His wont, seems to have rewarded this heroism (as it really is) in both these His servants even in the present life.

Renaissance in Italy: the Catholic Reaction. By JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS. In Two Parts. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1886.

IF we are somewhat late in noticing these two pretentious volumes no one is very much the worse. To adopt his own elephantine style, the writer has blown himself out with the wind of heterogeneous reading, and puffs it forth upon his reader with swollen cheek. "Over the Dead Sea of social putrefaction floated the sickening oil of Jesuitical hypocrisy." This little thing in sentences gives the measure of Mr. Symonds's historical stature; it also describes the point of view from which he treats Italian affairs during the fifty years which followed Luther's Reformation. He admits that all the Popes of that period—Paul III., Julius III., Paul IV., Pius IV., St. Pius V., Gregory XIII., and Sixtus V.—were good men, some of them really holy, and nearly all of them stern and active restorers of discipline (see vol. i. chap. ii.). He admits also that manners in Rome and throughout Italy were exteriorly much better than they had been for a long time. But all this is only "hypocrisy." He admits that nearly all the artists of that time, such as the Caracci, Guido Reni, Domenichino, and Guerrino, were men of blameless and even austere lives (see vol. ii. chap. xiii.); but it is only their "hypocrisy." Even Palestrina, prince of music as he was, wrote in a sentimental and "sensuous" style, moved thereto by the "sensuousness" of the Jesuit "exercises"! It is a pity that this absolutely frantic Philistinism has got such a hold of a man who has really read a good deal. What he says about the evil influence of the Spanish domination upon Italy is more or less true; and his pictures of the bad taste in things artistic of the age which followed Pope Leo X. is both true and striking. His descriptions, coloured much too highly, of the sinful and sanguinary intrigues of the higher classes could easily be matched in point of sinfulness in the contemporary annals of France or England; it is the refinement and superior civilization of the Italians which have drawn attention to Italian gallantry rather than to that of the comparatively boorish English, Germans, and French. But the writer has started with a thesis, and if the facts will not square with his thesis, the facts must look to themselves. The curious thing is that he is sometimes foolish enough to state the facts side by side with his own inferences. Thus, for example, he is fairly honest in his account of the careers of the various occupants of the Papal See; but his inference is that the "system" was "licentious" and an organized hypocrisy. He sets up the poet Tasso as the "representative martyr of his age;" yet he shows that the Tasso of "malevolent persecution" is simply legendary (vol. ii. p. 84), and that Popes and Princes vied with each other in honouring him and bearing with him till the state of his mind became so bad that he had to be placed under gentle restraint (vol. ii. chap. vii.). He gives a minute account of the life and opinions of the pestilent and mad atheist Giordano Bruno, showing him to have been a blasphemer, a

reviler of all religion, and a confessedly licentious brute—a man, in short, who would at that period have been tortured and executed without the slightest hesitation in any country of Europe, and most of all in England had Elizabeth cared as much for Christianity as she did for her own supremacy; yet he has the face to call him a “God-intoxicated man;” joy at attaining “the simple intuition of everlasting verity pulses through all his utterances;” and he finds it needful to go into all kinds of profound and pompous disquisitions on “his relation to the evolution of modern philosophy” (vol. ii. chap. ix.). He says a good deal about the vain and bitter calumniator Fra Paolo Sarpi, and admits (against Macaulay and Hallam) that he was certainly not a Protestant. He describes how he died in his monastery at Venice, after receiving the Holy Sacrament, embracing the crucifix and rendering his soul to God; yet he denies that he was a Catholic, and asserts that he worshipped the same God as Bruno! (vol. ii. p. 257). His animosity against the Jesuits is so violent as to make him incoherent; he states over and over again that a Jesuit is bound by obedience to commit a sin if his superior orders him, yet (vol. i. p. 283) he quotes this sentence from Jesuit authoritative writings:—“When it seems to me that I am commanded by my superior to do a thing against which my conscience revolts as *sinful*, and my superior judges otherwise, it is my duty to yield my doubts to him, unless I am constrained by evident reasons.” (The italics are our own.) But at the bottom of the same page he quotes this:—“A sin, whether venial or mortal, must be committed, if it is commanded by the superior in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ or in virtue of obedience.” These citations contradict one another. As to the latter, every intelligent reader can see the mistake, and those who are accustomed to deal with the theology of the religious vows can plainly read the mistranslation of the Latin. Mr. Symonds, usually particular even to pedantry in giving chapter and verse for his quotations, does not give one single specific reference for any of the sentences accumulated (vol. i. pp. 283, 284.) We are not obliged to search for the exact wording of the passage which he has been unable or unwilling to construe; but there can be no doubt among competent persons that it simply states that when a thing is formally commanded, and there is disobedience, a *sin is committed* (not “a sin must be committed”).

The book is wearisome and irritating. What religion Mr. Symonds himself professes he does not say, but he seems to be troubled with very little. A man who had any sense of the importance of the Christian Revelation would have something good to say even of the Index and the Spanish Inquisition.

Mr. Symonds's style is an appropriate vehicle for his robust and aggressively vulgar agnosticism, or naturalism, or deism, or whatever shade of heathenism he would confess to. He speaks of “apocalyptic sufferings,” “palpitating foreheads,” “blackguardly pointedness of expression,” “gimcrack titles,” “hypnotic dreams,” “beblubbered saints,” “wilding grace,” “polished carnalism,” &c. &c.

There is a grand chapter at the end of the second volume, dealing with the profoundest principles of taste and criticism. It is not much to the point, and is probably a rejected magazine article. Here is a sentence which is a fair sample of the whole:—"Successive waves of æsthetical preference, following one upon another with curious rapidity, sweep ancient fortresses of fame from their venerable basements, and raise upon the crests of wordy foam some delicate sea-shell that erewhile lay embedded in oblivious sand" (vol. ii. p. 394). Those who like this kind of thing may find it in great luxuriance throughout Mr. Symonds's work. He is under the impression that he has written a "popular book for English folk." It must be supposed that it is his fine instinct of what is appreciated by English folk that makes him say—"addressing a European audience, I should not have thought of eddying about the obsolete doctrine" of Sir Joshua Reynolds. And this is the man who criticizes Tasso and Reni and Palestrina.

Monotheism the Primitive Religion of Rome: an Historical Investigation. By the Rev. HENRY FORMBY. London: Burns & Oates.

THIS work is an attempt to demonstrate that the primitive religion of Rome was a monotheism imported from Jerusalem by Numa Pompilius, the second King. That a man of Mr. Formby's ability and industry should compile an essay of 350 pages on such a topic without saying much that is valuable and suggestive was not to be expected. If nothing else, he has brought together nearly all the available evidence bearing on the early religion of Rome. But that he has established his theory, or is likely to convince the learned world that it has "radically misconceived" early Roman history, we are more than doubtful. There are certain large assumptions lying at the root of the whole discussion, the failure of any one of which involves the collapse of the entire argument. In the first place, Mr. Formby freely allows that his theory absolutely depends on the hypothesis that Numa Pompilius was an historical personage, and that the story of his reign and legislation is reliable history. It is well known that all the early Roman history is, to say the least, very debatable ground. Critics have been found to maintain that "it was a mere fabulous legend, destitute of the least particle of foundation in fact;" but if this be intended for a description of the views of Niebuhr's school, it is no better than a crude caricature. Again, nineteenth-century criticism will hardly allow that the traditions about Numa and Pythagoras, current in the early years of the Christian era, and preserved in the writings of Plutarch, Jamblichus, Josephus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, St. Justin, and other writers of those days, can be accepted as sober history. St. Austin's "De Civitate Dei" is a great work; but no one can read it without perceiving that the notions about early history then current among

learned men cannot be received without a careful sifting. As has been said, the volume is in many ways valuable and suggestive; but it does not owe either quality to the formal discussion of the thesis it endeavours to establish.

History of England under Henry the Fourth. By J. H. WYLIE, M.A.
Vol. I., 1399–1404. London: Longmans & Co.

THE reign of Henry IV. is one that has had too little attention paid to it; it is despatched in ordinary textbooks in a page or two at most, and the student is apt to imagine that it covers a period unimportant and unworthy of serious consideration. That such is not the case Mr. Wylie's publication clearly demonstrates; for though we have before us only the first of the two volumes of which the work is to consist, yet we can say of it that it is replete with interest and instruction. The conduct and position of Parliament during this reign, the power and influence of the nobility, the civil administration of the country, and the system of defence against external foes are all fully treated, whilst most interesting accounts are given of the Percy family, and the warfare of the Welsh under their redoubtable leader, Owen Glendower. The reader cannot fail to be struck with the apparently hand-to-mouth system upon which the finances of the country were managed during this reign. There seems to have been a continual want of money, which more than once proved to be a source of danger to the good government and defence of the kingdom. Time after time the King was unable to send a handful of men to defend some Border castle because he had no money to pay them. Expeditions had frequently to be delayed and forces disbanded for want of a paltry sum; when an army ought to have been already in the field, the King was at his wits' ends trying to raise a few hundred pounds to enable him to hold a levy. Most of the money required for carrying on the government had to be obtained of course by vote of the Commons, and Parliament kept a very close watch upon the manner in which it was disbursed. It would be a great mistake to imagine that Mr. Labouchere and his friends are the first to call in question the manner in which money is spent upon royal residences, pensions, and the like. In the Parliament held at Westminster in 1404, "the Speaker, Sir Arnold Savage, drew attention to the abuses that already existed in allotting the sums previously voted. Castles, manors, lands, and annuities, were granted lavishly by the King without thought of the poverty of the nation. . . . In the King's household and in the royal domains abuses abounded. The profits from forests and from grazing were not employed for their proper purpose, *i.e.*, to keep up the royal estates, but given away to others, and then fresh grants were demanded to meet the necessary costs of maintenance and repairs. Establishments were maintained for the King at Westminster, Windsor . . . All these were kept at the public expense. . . .

Windsor was singled out as a glaring instance where abuses in the administration were most scandalous" (p. 407).

We feel constrained to observe that we consider Mr. Wylie's description of the savage state of the Irish, which occurs in the beginning of chapter xiii., greatly exaggerated. He speaks of them as being "a kind of wild people," as having "no town, house, castle, or fixed dwelling," as being "always in the woods;" "these were," he says, "the Irish or Celtic savages, among whom the English were but a small knot of armed settlers." If things were so, it is a little startling to read in the same page of these "armed settlers," that "many had intermarried with the Celtic families among whom they lived." But surely it is well known that at this time there was no such sharp distinction as is implied above between native and settler; many of the earlier settlers had adopted the manners and customs of the natives, and become more Irish than the Irish themselves. Moreover, we know that when Strongbow landed in Ireland two centuries before, he found Dublin, Waterford, Wexford, Kilkenny, and many other cities; is it credible, then, that during the intervening period the Irish had not only deserted their towns and cities, but even abandoned the use of houses and fixed dwellings? As a matter of fact, the ruins of MacMorrough's castles upon the Barrow and of many others are a distinct refutation of the assertion contained above.

There are some questions with respect to the Lollards and the Church at this period upon which we are not in perfect accord with Mr. Wylie, and about which we should like to have said a few words, but space forbids. On the whole, however, his volume is a most useful publication. It is written in a good clear style, with frequent references to authorities, which cannot fail to be serviceable to the student. Mr. Wylie has evidently employed much time and labour in its preparation, and we hope it may meet with the approval and success it fully deserves.

Life of Antonio Rosmini-Serbati, Founder of the Institute of Charity.
 Edited by WILLIAM LOCKHART. In Two Volumes. London:
 Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886.

IN April, 1884, we noticed the first volume of a "Life of Antonio Rosmini," by G. S. McWolter. It appears from the few words of preface, which the Very Rev. Father Lockhart has placed before this new issue, that the compiler of that volume was not spared to write the second and concluding one. It has now been thought best to reprint it, together with the second volume, in a smaller and less expensive form. The first volume would, in any case, have had to be reprinted, the edition having been exhausted; and the two volumes can now be had at the price of the first. Father Lockhart no doubt knows best; but many will regret that the handsome first volume of Mr. McWolter is not to be followed by a similar one. The

life of such a man as Rosmini was worthy of being worthily presented. But it is only just to say that the book now before us is admirably printed on good paper. It is enriched by a fair engraving of the subject of its pages.

The second volume begins with the month of June, 1849, when Rosmini returned from a brief sojourn at Naples to the pontifical court at Gaeta. It was at this time that whatever influence he may have had over Pius IX. began to pass away. Whether we are to attribute it to Cardinal Antonelli, as Father Lockhart implies, or to the alteration in the mind of the Pontiff himself, his "liberal," or, as we ought, perhaps, to say, when dealing with such a delicate matter, constitutional, counsels were no longer acceptable, and he could not persuade the Pope to think with favour of that constitution, which, although he considered it to be of an objectionable French type, Rosmini still thought its author should adhere to. He became almost suspected, and was honoured by the attentions of the Neapolitan police. His works were sent to the Holy Office to be examined. The "*Cinque piaghe*" and another of his essays were placed on the Index. To all this he submitted with perfect obedience and resignation. He returned to Stresa, and passed the last six years of his life in that beautiful spot, writing incessantly, directing his congregation, and enjoying the society, not only of many eminent men who actually joined his Institute, but of such friends as Manzoni and Pestalozza. He died on July 1, 1855, and is buried in the Church at Stresa, built by himself, where a marble tomb and statue commemorate him. Before describing his last illness and death, the Editor inserts a chapter of anecdotes and reminiscences contributed by a venerable priest of the Institute, one of the few who personally knew the founder—the Rev. Father Signini, of St. Etheldreda's, London. There is a very interesting chapter on the Fathers of Charity in England. The connection of men like Gentili, Pagani, and Gastaldi with the Catholic revival of forty or fifty years ago will not, and should not, be forgotten. After a short account of Rosmini's Congregation of Religious Women, the Sisters of Providence, we have chapters devoted to the founder's virtues, and then a series of dissertations on his philosophy. Into the polemic which has raged of late years about the orthodoxy of Rosmini's system, and about the pronouncements thereon of Roman congregations, we do not enter. Whatever may be said by the *Civiltà* and the *Divin Salvatore*, the good priests, brothers, and nuns of the Institute in England may well go on with their excellent work, in a holy indifference as to the storms which blow upon that huge fortress of eloquent exposition and bold speculation—the philosophical writings of Antonio Rosmini. Father Lockhart and his brethren have given the world in these volumes a memoir of a remarkable man, not only well written and well put together, but full of value to priests, to Catholic students, to literary men, and to those who are interested in the history of the Papacy.

Missale Romanum. Tornaci: Typis Desclée, Lefebvre et Socior. 1887.

THE well-known Tournay press has just brought out a useful missal in small, handy, quarto size, twenty by thirty inches, and specially approved of by the Congregation of Rites. Paper, printing, designs, and woodcuts are all of that character and excellence for which the Tournay publications are now famous.

Handbuch der Allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte. Von JOSEPH, CARDINAL HERGENROETHER. Dritter Band. III. Auflage. Freiburg: Herder. 1886.

THE first and second volumes of this third edition of Cardinal Hergenroether's Church History have been noticed in the DUBLIN REVIEW. Since their appearance the learned author has been a victim of apoplexy. In spite of this, however, and of heavy official duties as a member of the Roman Congregations, he has made time to give us a revised and corrected edition of the third volume. This volume begins with the Reformation, and brings us down to the Pontificate of Leo XIII., whose glorious reign is traced to 1886. It is quite unnecessary to express praise of this great work, which has made its way everywhere and is universally esteemed. Breadth of view characterizes it, with dogmatical accuracy and a rare power of dealing with the countless mass of facts and minute details. Witness, for example, the account given of the last two General Councils, Trent and Vatican. The student's attention should also be directed to the accurate tracing of the development of Christian science, and of the relations between Church and State. Here the Cardinal, one of the best canonists of our age, is able to explain and establish those Catholic tenets that for many years, in certain quarters, have been almost completely forgotten. The volume closes with most useful chronological tables.

BELLESHEIM.

Æsthetik. Von Dr. JOSEPH JUNGMANN, S.J., Professor der Theologie an der Universität zu Innsbruck. Dritte Auflage. II. Bände. Freiburg: Herder. 1886.

WE are rather late in noticing the above excellent treatise. Not too late, however, for a book which deserves the attention of Christian scholars who would test their principles of æsthetics by Christian philosophy rather than by those modern systems that are frequently at war with both Christianity and the dictates of sound, unprejudiced reason. Father Jungmann had scarcely finished the corrections of his last proof-sheets of this third edition when he died, November 25, 1885. It may, however, well be said of him: "Non omnis moriar;" for his volume on "Æsthetics" will live and be highly esteemed in Catholic quarters. In this work he states those æsthetic principles which, from Aristotle downwards, have been held

by both sound philosophers and true artists. Alas! one of the most baneful influences of modern thought has been the obliterating, even in the minds of not a few Catholic artists, of those leading religious ideas which should continually guide representation in every branch of the fine arts. Father Jungmann comes forward as the champion of these; and his book has already won, both within and without Catholic Germany, such a reputation as not many Catholic books can boast of. The first volume lays down the main principles of æsthetics. On the whole, the learned author is a faithful disciple of St. Thomas, although in several places he seems inclined to leave his leader by defining the nature of beauty not so much by the enjoyment one receives from the sight of what is beautiful, as by the harmony existing between the good and the beautiful and man's reason. "Pulchrum dicitur id, cujus ipsa apprehensio placet," had said St. Thomas. A chapter in the first volume examines and refutes modern theories of the beautiful, such as Addison's, Burke's, Blair's, Hutcheson's, Shaftesbury's, &c. English students will benefit by the perusal of such a work. The second volume treats of the fine arts individually with thoroughness and a vast amount of erudition. The leading place among the arts is assigned to architecture, and to the Gothic style as its fairest flower. The chapters on Poetry and Music are very interesting, while some illustrations enhance the volumes, and accurate indices add to its value for reference.

Dissertationes Selectæ in Historiam Ecclesiasticam. Auctore BERNARDO JUNGMAN. Tom. VI. Ratisbonæ: Pustet. 1886.

THE five preceding volumes of Professor Jungmann's valuable contribution to Church History have been duly noticed in this REVIEW. The nearer we come to modern times the more intense grows the interest we feel in the subject-matter of the learned author's dissertations. The present volume we find is chiefly occupied with questions which, in our own day, were warmly discussed previous to the Vatican Council. The dissertation on the glorious pontificate of Boniface VIII. deserves special mention. The author allows documents to speak for themselves, and this method brings before us the person of the great Pope in all its grandeur. Few Popes have been so grossly assailed by the sneers and calumnies of the superficial and the uninstructed, whilst few have deserved better of the Church. Equally good is the next dissertation on the Templars. It cannot be denied that indictments of the most grievous nature were brought against the Order. The suppression of the Templars by Clement V. indeed was made only "per modum provisionis;" but it should be borne in mind that the members of the Council were unanimous in urging the Pope on to suppression forthwith. Clement V., therefore, cannot be justly taunted with having weakly yielded to the urgency of the French King. At the same time Dr. Jungmann does not neglect to hint at the prejudice to the in-

terests of the Church inseparable from the stay of the Popes at Avignon.

Another dissertation which claims special attention is that on the Council of Constance. The author is strong on the point that Gregory XII. was the only legitimate Pope at that critical period, and that it is only from his recognition that the Council convened at Constance is invested with the character of ecumenicity. The well known, and often abused decrees of the third and fourth sessions, in the genuine sense of their authors, were intended as remedies for the evils then threatening the Church, not as enduring legislation. Undoubtedly these decrees were afterwards adopted by the Council of Basel. Indeed, Eugene IV., by his Bull "*Dudum sacrum*," disclaimed his suppression of the latter synod, but, by that procedure he never intended to approve of the alleged decrees of Basel. Dr. Jungmann is fortunate in establishing the fact that the Pope approved only the continuation of the synod, without seconding in the least its decrees. The last dissertation is on the state of the Church at the close of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries. In it the author deals with the state of Europe and the causes leading to that outbreak of widespread social, political, and religious anarchy, the so-called Reformation. No honest historian will deny that abuses existed. It is a duty of the Catholic to set forth the *real* truth in this matter, and throw all possible light on long cherished but mistaken views, and this is the valuable task which Dr. Jungmann has ably and successfully accomplished.

BELLESHEIM.

L'Allemagne à la Fin du Moyen Age. Par JEAN JANSSEN. Traduit de l'Allemand sur la quatorzième Edition, avec une Préface de M. G. A. HEINRICH. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1887.

THE appearance of this well-executed French translation of the first volume of the now famous "*Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*" is important. The work is thus brought within reach of a much wider English audience; and the want of an English translation, if still a grievance, becomes less of a privation. So much was said in this REVIEW of the nature and character of the contents of the first and second volumes of the original, as recently as July, 1880, that we may well refer those who may not yet have heard of Janssen to that notice. It is now, however, very generally known that his History has been an epoch-making book, and has raised against itself a storm of opposition and loud invective, natural enough when we remember that it came before the German public as the deathblow of the old Protestant tradition. That the Reformation was a glorious event in the interests of both religious and social Germany; that it put an end to the thralldom of Rome; that when Luther appeared on the scene the clergy were ignorant and corrupt; that religion had degenerated into phrases and ceremonies; that the people had not

sound doctrine preached to them ; that the Bible was a closed book to the people until Luther translated it—against all this and much besides in the same strain, which made up the German's notion of the origin of Protestantism, Herr Janssen has directed his attack. It has been irresistible ; and such replies as have been made he has abundantly answered. His wonderful success is due to the array of incontestible evidence which he has incorporated into his narrative. The glamour and the glory are gone from the German Reformation.

The present volume has for its sub-title "The Intellectual Condition of Germany at the Close of the Middle Ages"—that is, at the eve of the Lutheran revolution. It contains the "apologia" of Catholic civilization, showing that the "reform" was an upheaval of the worst elements of society, a disturbance of existing relations, eminently prejudicial to the best interests of German society, to the arts, to the scientific spirit, to poetry, to prose ; prejudicial to the life of the peasant, to the best interests of the artisan. Janssen gives a picture of the true condition of society and the people, of the condition of education in elementary schools, middle-class schools, and in the Universities. He explodes for ever the fiction about the Bible—not only were there numerous editions of it (fourteen in high and six in low German) before 1520, but they were widely read. The people also had books of devotion. Vast numbers of the clergy not only did their duty, but the people were better instructed than is imagined. Preaching was not neglected (see Chapter II.). How then came the revolution ? It was one of those recurrent periods of crisis ; the alternative of revolution was due to many converging causes. There were, first, the consequences attending the invention of printing and the wide dispersion of scurrilous publications on one hand, and the Bible on the other, among minds utterly unprepared to receive it, and proud and self-confident in proportion to their ignorance. There was the anti-Christian tendency of the Younger Humanists, intoxicated with the heathenism of their classics. There was the widespread, ever-growing passion for amassing riches, spreading itself also in the ranks of the clergy. There was the evil that while the Church of Germany was the richest in Christendom, numbers of the lower clergy, who bore the burdens and the heats, were sunk in poverty, yet yearning like the crowd for wealth. Prelates were chosen not for their merits, but for their noble birth ; many monasteries and convents were shut save to the noble, &c. There was, finally, the political condition and relations of the Empire. Janssen also lays great stress on the prejudicial effect of the forcible introduction of Roman law, "in its essential points in complete opposition with the principles of the Christian German law," and the introduction of which in the fifteenth century put an end to the "old German traditions ;" and to this topic he devotes a considerable portion of the fourth book of this volume. The last eighteen pages of the volume, headed "Résumé—Transition," are highly pathetic, and give a wonderfully vivid picture. There are two good indices, one of persons and the other of places.

The Ritual of the New Testament. An Essay on the Principles and Origin of Catholic Ritual in Reference to the New Testament. By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. Third Edition. London: Burns & Oates. 1887.

IT is with singular gratification that we welcome the republication of Father Bridgett's work, which has for some time been out of print. It is a book which we cannot afford to lose; a masterly statement of the grounds of Christian ritual; and therefore answering to one of the most frequent difficulties of inquirers into the Catholic religion. The whole work is admirably thought out, and the handling of the New Testament narrative is so fresh and true that it throws a light of its own on innumerable texts, giving them a new controversial or doctrinal aspect; and thus it is a most useful help for the preacher as well as for the controversialist and the teacher. A third edition of such a work from the pen of a Catholic in defence of the ritual merely of the Catholic Church is itself the best commendation; proving that Father Bridgett has in it met a want, and met it satisfactorily. Indeed, it would be difficult to see how the case of the Church's ritual, her pomp and ceremonies, and sacramental ordinances, as against the spirit of Puritanism prevalent in Low Church and among Dissenters, could be better stated or more ably defended. He answers those who look on vestments with genuine Protestant horror, and regard "Ritualism" as "the highway to Rome," and constantly assert that the character of our Lord, the writings and practice of His Apostles, the whole spirit of Christ and His Apostles, is the condemnation of symbol and ceremonial; that New Testament worship is in spirit and truth, and that what our Lord meant by "spirit and truth" was (to quote Dr. Vaughan, the opponent whom Father Bridgett most frequently deals with), "at the least, that no such ritual system as the history of Judaism presents was to have any place in the Christian Church." He has also written with a view to the needs of his fellow Catholics. And few, we venture to think, can peruse his book without a certain warming of the heart and deepening of one's feelings of reverence and love towards the ancient and venerable rites of the holy sacrifice and the sacraments. The honest manner in which Father Bridgett states the views of his opponents, his readiness to allow for their feelings, his moderation in refusing to make more of a point than is logically just, his finely worded, consistent statement of New Testament ritual, his forcible replies, relentless refusal to accept Protestant tradition for Scripture meaning, make the perusal of his pages quite a treat. His excellent chapters on "The Divine Pageantry of Our Lord's Life on Earth," on "Apostolic Worship," on "The Symbolism of Vestments," on "The Use of Latin in the Liturgy," on "The Ritual of Baptism and Holy Eucharist," as a key to the reticence of the New Testament record, may be mentioned in particular, by way of recommending an invaluable book to those, Catholic or Protestant, who may not yet have read it.

1. *The Religious Houses of the United Kingdom.* Containing a Short History of every Order and House. Compiled from Official Sources. London: Burns & Oates. 1887.
2. *The Catholic Year-Book.* A Handy History of the Catholic Church in Great Britain in 1886. Edited by JOHN OLDCASTLE. London: Burns & Oates.

WE have transcribed the title-pages of these two excellent books at length, because they sufficiently explain the object and contents thereof. The first-named volume gives the Religious Orders of men established in England, arranged alphabetically, and then those of women, prefacing the list of establishments possessed by each with a short sketch of the Order itself and its objects. It is correct so far as we have noticed, and will prove a useful work of reference. In "The Catholic Year-Book" Mr. Oldcastle chronicles, month by month, the chief events of Catholic interest of every description and degree of importance or triviality—presentations to priests, deaths, celebrations, and conversions. It will be valuable in after years as a record. We hope this venture will be so encouraged that it may be repeated in future years.

The Church and the Sects. Ten Letters in Defence and Continuation of the Pamphlet entitled "Which is the True Church?" By C. F. B. ALLNUTT. First Series. Five Letters. London: Burns & Oates. 1887.

MR. ALLNUTT'S works are indeed a treasury of things new and old; a storehouse whence the priest, controversialist, lecturer, and preacher may draw according to need. His "Cathedra Petri" is a splendid catena of Patristic evidence; and looking at its pages, crowded with the witness of the Fathers and Saints of the first eight or nine centuries, one sees vividly how trivial when compared therewith are the quibbles raised regarding this or that seemingly flaw in the testimony or dissentient voice. Mr. Allnutt's next work, "Which is the True Church?" contained some "plain reasons" for joining the Roman Catholic Communion. The present pamphlet is supplementary and explanatory of that work; and it is sufficient praise for us to say of it that it is not unworthy of its author's reputation. The chief points defended in it from adverse criticism are the Visibility of the Church, and her "Sanctity" considered as one of her "Notes," the Authority of the Church, the Value of Scripture Authority, &c. The Letters are characterised, as are the former works, by a wealth of apposite quotations from ancient Fathers and from modern writers of every kind and creed; not the least valuable and telling evidence often being newspaper items and the undesignated testimony of strongly anti-Catholic authors. We shall be glad to see the remaining five letters of this series.

Pensées sur Divers Sujets. Par le VTE. DE BONNAT. Publiées avec une Introduction et les Notes par M^{LE} JOSEPH DE BONNETON. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1887.

SOME of us probably know of De Bonnat's name chiefly in connection with his philosophical opinion as to the original "revelation" of human language. The introduction to this little volume shows how voluminous a writer he was, on a wide variety of topics—philosophy, politics, social economy, religion, history, literature: and the "pensées" in the body of the work will show that he was also a profound thinker and keen logician. He was an exile during the Great Revolution, and died in 1840, aged 56. The publishers call him the "genial émule de Joseph Maistre"—high praise, but apparently not undeserved. Best of all he was a good Catholic. He loved the Church, says his editor, *en chrétien*: he defended his king *en gentleman*: he hated the Revolution *en Français*, and drew his course with the penetration of genius. We should much have liked to quote some of the longer sentences giving his more thoughtful political judgments, but space forbids. We take one or two, therefore, at random, picking the briefest:—

Les institutions les plus charitables ont été établies par des hommes avides, et lésinés par des philanthropes p. 217.

Il n'y a en Europe, pendant vingt ans, que les vies courtes et faussées en politique, parce qu'il n'y a eu aucune vie religieuse: car il n'y a que la religion qui entende politique p. 36.

Une pensée est toujours vraie: mais elle est souvent incomplète, et l'erreur n'est que défaut de pensée p. 215.

"Vous serez des dieux," dit aux premiers hommes, celui qui a fait dans le monde la première révolution. "Vous serez des rois," ont dit aux peuples ceux qui ont fait la dernière. Et toujours l'orgueil! Qu'elle est vraie et profonde, la doctrine qui a recommandé l'humilité! (p. 109).

A miscellaneous collection of "thoughts" gathered from various works into one book, is pre-eminently the sort of book that cries for an index. It is a great drawback to the usefulness of this volume that it has no table, index, or means of reference.

Hazell's Annual Cyclopædia 1887. Edited by E. D. PRICE, F.G.S. Revised to February 7th, 1887. London: Hazell, Watson & Viney. 1887.

WE note in this new annual numerous additions and improvements on the first year's issue of 1886. This Cyclopædia is a novelty, and answers to a want. It is a collection of nearly 2,000 "concise and explanatory articles, on every topic of current political, social, and general interest referred to by the press and in daily conversation;" at least, such is its ambitious programme, carried out, one must admit, with a marvellous approach towards success. Complete, absolutely, such a work can never be; every day brings both changes and novelties in the "political, social, and general" world; but it is an indispensable companion to the

newspaper. We have noted a few things we should have liked to criticize, but lack of space forbids more than this word of laudatory notice. The article on the "Roman Catholic Church" is far better than we could have anticipated, but which of the editor's "eminent specialists" is answerable for the twaddle *sub voce* "Catholic," where we are told that the term "Catholic" "is now used by Churchmen to differentiate themselves from Nonconformists. ROMAN Catholics and ANGLICAN Catholics, though both are strictly Catholic, must not be confused; it is incorrect to speak of either as 'Catholics' alone!"

Les Affaires Religieuses en Bohême au Seizième Siècle, depuis l'Origine des Frères Bohêmes jusques, et y compris, la Lettre de Majesté de 1609. Par E. CHARVÉRIAT. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1886.

M. CHARVÉRIAT has already published a "History of the Thirty Years War," which was crowned by the French Academy; the present volume is the result of his further studies in the same direction. In trying, he says, to search anew for the causes which led to the outbreak of that war, he was led to study the religious and political situation of Bohemia in the sixteenth century. And he has produced a highly interesting volume, written in a direct, precise, clear style, that is very satisfactory to the inquiring reader, and is not always to be found in similar French monographs. The first chapter takes us back to the origin of the Moravian Brethren, which the author places in the middle of the fifteenth century, Peter Chelcicky being called their "chief founder." The whole story of the Brethren is here traced on the lines of A. Gindely's standard work, the "*Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*;" indeed, M. Charvériat acknowledges in his preface that his work throughout is founded on one or other of Gindely's learned and authoritative works. However, we agree to his assertion that it is a positive advantage to French students, and we may add also to the numerous English ones who can consult French works more readily than German, to have thus epitomized the works of an author who used so largely Czech documents, mostly MSS., and consequently inaccessible to any but a few specialists. We have next a very interesting chapter on "Lutheranism in Bohemia," followed by chapters on, respectively, the "Revolt of Bohemia against Ferdinand;" "Maximilian II.;" the "Bohemian Confession" (the Diet of 1575); "Rodolph II. and the Diets," in which the weak and miserable character of Rodolph is well set forth; and, finally, the "Majestäts-brief" of 1609, to which also Gindely has devoted one of his volumes. The volume closes with the dissolution of the Diet in February, 1610, leaving us within less than a decade of the Thirty Years War. One of the most interesting portions of the volume is that which tells of the conspicuous part played by the Jesuits in the Catholic reform. "The Catholic religion," the author tells us "was losing ground

daily, and had no help to hope from Rodolph, and would probably have disappeared from Bohemia, but for the Jesuits." They defended it with such vigour and ability as to triumph over all difficulties. They worked through the schools and colleges; young candidates for the priesthood received their special attention—and needed it. They were helped by the nobility, especially by the Spanish and Italian wives of the nobles. They established missions everywhere, and taught and preached with ultimate success (pp. 276–278). There is much to be picked up also from these pages illustrative of the relative amount of "tolerance and intolerance" shown by either side in the mutual struggles between the Catholics and the Lutherans. At the same time, the author does well to remind his readers of the very different notion prevalent of "tolerance" in the sixteenth century and in our own day (p. 71). There is an excellently full and accurate index, in which respect M. Charvériat's volume is a model for the imitation of his countrymen generally.

-
1. *Synoptical Lectures on the Books of Holy Scripture.* By DONALD FRASER, M.A., D.D. Two Volumes. Fourth Edition. London: J. Nisbet. 1886.
 2. *Daniel.* An Exposition of the Historical Portion of the Writings of the Prophet Daniel. By the Very Rev. R. PAYNE-SMITH, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. London: J. Nisbet. 1886.
 3. *Four Centuries of Silence; or, from Malachi to Christ.* By the Rev. R. A. REDFORD, M.A., L.L.B. London: J. Nisbet. 1885.
 4. *Zechariah: his Visions and Warnings.* By the late Rev. W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D.D. London: J. Nisbet. 1885.
 5. *Authorship of the Four Gospels, from a Lawyer's Point of View.* By W. MARVIN. London: J. Nisbet. 1886.
 6. *Atonement and Law.* By JOHN M. ARMOUR. London: J. Nisbet. 1886.
 7. *The Theological Educator.* Edited by Rev. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A. No. 1. PREBENDARY ROW'S *Christian Evidences*. No. 2. PROFESSOR WARFIELD'S *Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1887.
 8. *St. Paul's Teaching on Sanctification.* By JAMES MORISON, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.
 9. *The Charter of Christianity.* (The Sermon on the Mount.) By the Rev. ANDREW TAIT, D.D. &c. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.
 10. *The Revelation of St. John.* By W. MILLIGAN, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.
 11. *Theology of the Hebrew Christians.* By F. RENDALL, A.M. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

WE regret that want of space obliges us to crowd these books together and to give them so scanty a notice. The fact, too, that these works are by non-Catholic writers on Scriptural and

religious subjects will explain the difficulty there must be in treating them adequately in a Catholic Review. Dr. Fraser's lectures will be of service to those who wish to study the Holy Scriptures for homiletic purposes. Dr. Payne-Smith's "Daniel" is an excellent popular defence of that much-maligned Prophet. Dr. Lindsay Alexander's valuable papers on "Zechariah" in the *Homiletic Quarterly* have been collected and published after his death by Mr. Hastings. The Scripture student will find them a great help in his study of this most difficult prophet. Professor Redford's book is an attempt to popularize Prideaux's Connection, and contains much interesting matter. We object strongly to many things which he says of the Apocrypha. As an instance we might quote his extraordinary statement that the Apocrypha "were never quoted by any Apostolic writer!" (p. 85). The last two of Mr. Nisbet's publications hail from America. Of these Mr. Marvin's lawyer-like defence of the Four Gospels is likely to be of real service in this incredulous age.

Judging from the two volumes sent to us, the new series of primers entitled "The Theological Educator" promises to be of great help to students. There is a freshness and originality in Prebendary Row's treatment of the Evidences, and Professor Warfield's handbook will initiate the student into all the mysteries of Dr. Hort's genealogical descent of the various texts. Dr. Tait's "Charter of Christianity" is an homiletic explanation of the Sermon on the Mount. Except in the matter of textual criticism, we have not noticed in it much which we had not before met in our ordinary Catholic Commentaries; it is, on the whole, a fairly good, but a very diffuse, production. It was not to be expected that the "Evangelical Counsels" would be used in the higher interpretation of the Beatitudes, but we very gladly note that Dr. Tait maintains the Catholic interpretation of verse 32 as regards divorce.

Perhaps Professor Milligan's "Lectures on the Apocalypse" is the most important work of those enumerated above. It is a matter of congratulation to find a Protestant scholar who, despite of Dr. Wordsworth, has at once the courage to reject the old anti-Papal explanation, and the modern notion now so prevalent that the Neronian legend is the true key. Mr. Rendall's "Theology of the Hebrew Christians" is the outcome of his studies on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and furnishes a useful treatise on the sacrificial language of the New Testament. Like most modern interpreters, Mr. Rendall supports the covenant explanation even in Hebrews ix. 16, 17.

The Acts of the Apostles. Arranged as a Reading-book for the use of Catholic Colleges and Schools. By C. H. POOLE, LL.D. London: Burns & Oates.

THE arrangement of suitable portions of Sacred Scripture in paragraphs for religious reading in our schools is certainly to be recommended. Mr. Poole's arrangement of the Acts is an excellent example of such treatment. The text followed is the Rheims trans-

lation of the Vulgate. The notes are short, clear, and to the point. We venture to hope that when Mr. Poole speaks of Catholic colleges he means only the elementary classes, and that Greek has not become such a very dead language that our students are no longer able to read the New Testament in the original.

1. *Percy's Revenge*. By CLARA MULHOLLAND. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1887.
2. *The Coiner's Cave*. By WILHELM HERCHENBACH. Translated by Mrs. JOSEPHINE BLACK. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1887.

TWO unusually good story-books these, deserving the attractive style and binding in which the publishers send them out. Miss Mulholland's original tale has a moral which is well enforced by the progress of events, and not tacked on by way of reflection. Percy is a hunchback, and learns at last to bear his misfortune cheerfully. It is a well-written and bright book for boy or girl. Mrs. Black has translated a German story that was worth the care she must have spent upon it. It is a straightforward, honest story of the good old-fashioned sort, much more sensational than "*Percy's Revenge*," yet quite healthy in tone. After the genuine horrors experienced among the coiners, the book ends happily. Descriptions and dialogue read well in their excellent English dress.

1. *Thekla: an Autobiography*. By Lady HERBERT. London: Burns & Oates.
2. *The Miser of King's Court*. By CLARA MULHOLLAND. London: Burns & Oates.
3. *Annunziata; or, the Gipsy Child*. By LAETITIA SELWYN OLIVER. London: M. H. Gill & Son. 1887.

THE first and last of this triad of small tales ends in the conversion of the principal characters, from which it may be justly inferred that Lady Herbert and Miss Oliver have written each an edifying story, and that uncles and aunts, who are looking out for "suitable presents," may fearlessly venture upon "*Thekla*" and "*Annunziata*." On the other hand, Miss Mulholland's book is (studiously, it would seem) kept colourless as far as religion is concerned. The death of the poor, sorely-tried mother in the first chapter is just tinged with sufficient religion to be positively demoralizing. She talks of her "Heavenly Father," and says how she longs to "go home" to Him—to the "deep, long sleep of those He loves;" and then with an aspiration, it is true, but without any sign either of desire for sacrament or of contrition, she falls asleep and passes away. This kind of picture may be true to life; but it is not worth while, in these days of indifference, to write a "religious" book and leave out

Christianity. The story is fairly well planned and brightly written ; but the characters are only suits of clothes. A boy of five does not generally call his writing-lesson "pot-hooks," though it comes natural enough to his grown-up historian to do so. Neither does he in real life express his opinion of the weather by saying, "Isn't the air delicious?"

Lady Herbert's heroine, who tells her own story, does not enable the reader to feel there is any particular moral in her vicissitudes between infancy and (early) marriage. We are told she is very old-fashioned and experienced for her age, and we see that she is fond of dogs. But none of the dogs have any influence on the story ; and the young lady's powers of managing only make us disbelieve in her recorded age. The tale contains some vivid Roman sketches, and a few pages about Connemara which appear to be written from personal knowledge.

"Annunziata" presents us with the well-known old woman of fiction, who steals a child, grows old in deceit, repents just before she dies, and then bursts a blood-vessel before she can "reveal." The personages, however, who get into confusion and out again, through the repetition of this person's evil conduct, are well, if slightly sketched. The tale depends for its success on a certain eloquent and touching presentment of religious and Catholic feeling. But, perhaps, this graceful writer might have made it clear that a young girl is not exactly doing right in giving repeated secret meetings to a young gentleman. Dramatically, considering the heroine's character, the thing may have been done without guile ; but a kind of "chorus," moralizing on right and wrong, is absolutely necessary in all stories which transcribe modern life as it really is.

The Feudal History of the County of Derby. By JOHN PYM YEATMAN, Esq. Vol. I. London : Bemrose. 1886.

THOSE who are interested in Derbyshire will welcome this first volume of a new history of their county. The task Mr. Yeatman has set himself, if carried out in the spirit in which it is begun, will earn the gratitude not only of those who are students of the history of that special county, but of all genealogists. If we mistake not, the author's method of treating a county history is his own. It is not every one who, having the ability and patience necessary for original research, would content himself with giving to the public copies of the documents he has discovered which bear on his subject, and be able to resist the temptation to enlarge his stock of original material with judicious padding.

In the two sections of the volume before us Mr. Yeatman proves that he possesses this commendable self-restraint, and in the subsequent volumes, if we do not mistake his meaning, he intends to give the public the documents which relate to Derbyshire, and which must be the basis of any reliable county history. Only those

who have had acquaintance with the work and know the difficulties which beset the path of a searcher into things unknown at the Record Office and elsewhere, can appreciate the luxury of having a collection for a county history placed within reach in a printed form. Indeed, the work is so obviously one of general utility that we might have reasonably expected it would have been long ago undertaken by the officials of the Rolls Office. In the present volume the author has given us a translation of the Derbyshire portion of Domesday Book, extracts from the Pipe Rolls for the county to the end of the reign of Edward I., the Red Book of the Exchequer, the Testa de Nevil, and some other extracts of documents relating to his subject. To each of these portions of the volume he has prefixed introductory explanations as to the nature and utility of the record. For example, he draws special attention to the importance of the Pipe Rolls in tracing the pedigrees of county families, although strangely enough these records have been almost entirely overlooked by most county historians. The letterpress to the Testa de Nevil extracts is particularly of interest to the historical student, and the author throws much light on the date of the document, which is of such importance for 13th century history, about which the editor for the Master of the Rolls in 1833 appears to have had very hazy ideas.

The printing, paper and general get-up of the volume is all that the most fastidious could desire, and it is enriched by one of the best indexes we have ever seen, which should prove a mine of wealth to the genealogical student.

-
1. *The Cornhill Magazine*. Vol. VI., January—June. Vol. VII., July—December, 1886. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1886.
 2. *The English Illustrated Magazine*. 1885—1886. London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1886.

THE two volumes of the *Cornhill* for last year are excellent ones, and will maintain the reputation of this old and favourite magazine. We have for long past looked into the *Cornhill* with pleasure, and do not remember to have seen anything that would unfit it for the young or for general reading in Catholic families. The serial novels are of good literary quality—"Court Royal" we have already noticed; Mr. Haggard's "Jess" is not yet finished. Of shorter stories there is an abundance, and generally they are enjoyable. The popular science papers have long been noteworthy in the *Cornhill*; some of them models of what such papers can be made. In the number for July, 1886, there is an interesting article telling what Mrs. Ernest Hart has done towards helping industry in Donegal. Her shop at 43, Wigmore Street, Portland Place, for the sale of home-knit stockings and stuffs, has since then been much spoken of; but it is interesting to read here

how she was led to revive industries once pursued in the district—spinning, weaving, knitting, embroidery, &c.

The volume of the *English Illustrated* should have been acknowledged in our last number. The magazine has now won for itself a high place in public estimation, and this, when its small price and the competition it must maintain with American "illustrateds" are taken into account, is very creditable to its managers. We may note in particular Mr. Hugh Thomson's sketches, illustrative of "Sir Roger de Coverley;" they are first-rate, and well deserve to be issued apart, as we see they have lately been. The letterpress maintains an excellent average of literary excellence and general interest.

A Lecture on Catholic Ireland. By the Rev. J. P. PRENDERGAST.
Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 1886.

THIS brochure is an eloquent exposition, by an Irish priest, on the Catholicism of the people of Ireland; how they became Catholic, how they continued Catholic, and how they are Catholic to this day. We are informed that it was originally delivered to the Catholics of Ashton-under-Lyne about four years ago.

King, Prophet, and Priest; or, Lectures on the Catholic Church. By the Rev. H. C. DUKE. London: Burns & Oates.

THE special feature of this series of lectures is the development given to the dogma of the divine Mission of the *Ecclesia Docens*. The force of the question, "Who sent you?" applied to the various religious bodies claiming to be the Church of Christ, cannot be over-rated. As the apostles and their successors were sent to rule, to teach, and to administer the sacraments, so the lecturer, insisting separately on each element, has aptly chosen "King, Prophet, and Priest" as his title. His reasoning is close and convincing, and the numerous quotations from the Fathers concur to give his work value of its own.

Henry Bazely, the Oxford Evangelist. A Memoir, by the Rev. E. L. HICKS, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THIS book will hardly appeal to any beyond a very limited circle. Mr. Bazely had attained to the dignity of what are called "Deacon's orders" in the Anglican Establishment, but subsequently abandoned that coign of vantage, and joined the Scotch Presbyterians. He was well known, chiefly at Oxford, as a revivalist preacher, and in that capacity he was a frequent attendant at fairs, race-courses, &c., where he preached and sold Bibles and tracts. We are strongly of opinion that open-air preaching, which never can lead to Sacraments, is not only generally useless, but often injurious to the highest interests

of religion. But we are not now discussing the point; it will be sufficient to note what we gather from the introduction, "that it was due to Bazely's memory that his *precise theological attitude* (the italics are ours) should be made known once for all." This precise theological attitude seems to have denoted strong Calvinism, extreme scruples about purity of worship, and unvarying hostility to such Catholic principles as the Anglican sect may lay claim to. We may piously hope that undoubted and active charity to the poor may have balanced the shortcomings of narrowness of view. Not a bad subtitle to the book would have been "*Private judgment in excelsis*."

The Final Science; or, Spiritualist Materialism. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls. 1885.

PROFESSING to be written by an ardent disciple, this is really a very trenchant attack upon the evolutionary and materialist philosophy of the day. Mr. Herbert Spencer, Vogt, Büchner, and the like, are abundantly open to satire; but it may be doubted whether such a weapon, however legitimate, and effective in a magazine article, is so serviceable in a work of near two hundred pages. The assumptions, inconsistencies, and fallacies of this school will, however, be found well exposed in this little volume.

An Abridgment of the Catechism ordered by the National Synod at Maynooth, and approved of by the Cardinal, Archbishops, and Bishops of Ireland for general use throughout the Irish Church. Translated from English, and printed with the authority of the Archbishop of Tuam. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THIS catechism is correctly printed, and will be very useful to Irish-speaking people, as also to those who may wish to learn the Irish language. While free from the archaisms of the old Irish, it is removed from the vulgarisms of a modern *patois*. The Irish petition in the Litany, however, would really be rendered by *Deus, Pater cœlestis*, and so does not literally represent *Pater de cœlis, Deus*.

Une Invasion Prussienne en Hollande en 1787. Par PIERRE DE WITT. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit & Cie.

THIS work elucidates an episode but little known either in France or England, and lovers of political history ought to feel grateful to M. de Witt for making them acquainted with a series of events which are not only interesting in themselves, but full of European significance. When we consider that the author is descended from a family highly distinguished in Dutch annals, and entirely devoted to the French alliance, we must admit that he has described the

"Prussian Invasion of Holland," and its causes, with creditable impartiality. In his expression of opinions a certain bias is apparent, but in relating facts he displays that regard to truth, the absence of which, in a would-be historian, can only result in the production of a spoiled romance.

The family of Orange-Nassau had made and maintained the independence of the Seven Provinces. William I. undoubtedly aimed at establishing an hereditary monarchy in his house, but death cut short his career, and the Princes of Orange finally transmitted to each other only the dignity of Stadtholder or chief magistrate. In a country like Holland, a republic yet possessing a powerful aristocracy and opulent *bourgeoisie*, such a position was not without its drawbacks, and even the Taciturn had at times met with resistance from the States which owed their existence to his energy and cunning. However, so long as men of talent occupied the Stadtholderate, it was found advantageous to have a headship to the commonwealth; but when a nonentity in the shape of William II. came into power, and married a strong-minded Prussian wife, a large party among the unmannerly Republicans, under the name of "patriots," set up systematic resistance to his rule.

The recent example of the States of America animated their ardour against monarchism. This party was in the pay of the French ambassador; and it seems a strange irony that France, then on the very brink of the Great Revolution, should have tried to foment a small revolution in a neighbouring country. The Stadtholder and his wife, in their struggle to maintain rather more than their rights, received the encouragement and partial support of England, but very ably represented at The Hague by Sir James Harris, afterwards Lord Malmesbury. But Prussia was the power destined to settle the question by force of arms. England had not the desire, France had not the strength, or the determination, to throw her sword into the scale; but Frederic William II. of Prussia, brother to Wilhelmina Princess of Orange, emerged at last from the dreamy society of mystics and favourites to come to the rescue of a sister who was far more kinglike than himself. There was no time to be lost. Amsterdam and several other towns had declared against the Stadtholder; Wilhelmina had been stopped and turned back in an attempted journey from Nimeghen to the Hague; the patriots were beginning to triumph. But their triumph was cut short. In September, 1787, the Duke of Brunswick, aided by the energetic counsels of Sir James Harris, led a Prussian army into Holland, and made of it a rapid conquest. The Hollanders, who had never been really apt at fighting, and who had won their independence rather through the unwisdom of their opponents, and geographical circumstances, than through any military prowess of their own, happened now to be most pitifully commanded by the boastful and incapable Rhinegrave of Salm. The French officers who assisted the patriots were unable to inspire their rude allies with their own martial fire, and Holland hopelessly succumbed. The war was in reality an

episode in that rivalry which has existed between France and Prussia ever since the latter became a kingdom; but it was a episode in which Prussia had all the advantage of situation. When the crisis came, France, sapped by corruption, and trembling at the approach of an unheard-of convulsion, could lift no finger to aid the malcontents of Holland. The anti-Orange towns fell one by one; the Princess entered the Hague in triumph; the mob, less phlegmatic than might be supposed, murdered certain patriots and pillaged their houses; Amsterdam, last and greatest of the "rebel cities, capitulated on the 12th of October; and the fortunes of the wonderfully fortunate House of Orange were re-established at the very time when those of the House of Bourbon began to set in the storm-clouds of the Revolution.

Christian Iconography. By the late ADOLPHE NAPOLEON DIDRON
Translated from the French by E. J. MILLINGTON, and Completed, with Additions and Appendices, by MARGARET STOKES
Vol. II. London: George Bell & Sons. 1886.

THIS volume is the completion of a work left unfinished for 20 years; M. Didron's death in 1867 having interrupted this and all his other antiquarian studies. Miss Stokes' reputation as one of the ablest of living archaeologists is a sufficient guarantee for the excellence of her share in the present volume, which is indeed no small one, as a considerable portion of it is altogether her own, while the materials left by her predecessor had to be collected, arranged, and amplified, by her editorial skill. The connection between mediæval and antique art is dealt with in an interesting chapter, conclusively showing that the blending of classical and Christian tradition was not, as some modern critics have sought to prove, an invention of the Renaissance, but a result of the general law of human development, by which the new structure is raised on the foundation of the old. The influence of the drama on iconography is also the subject of another chapter, and a very valuable portion of the work is that in which the general scheme of early Christian art is traced to its sources in ancient manuals laying down the sequence of subjects and general manner of their treatment. Each scene in the New Testament was here associated with two in the Old, regarded as its symbolical types. Thus the Holy Family in Egypt, when the idols of the inhabitants miraculously fell, is grouped with the destruction of the golden calf by Moses and the fall of Dagon in presence of the Ark. We have only to add that Miss Stokes everywhere deals with Christian symbolism in a thoroughly reverential spirit.

The Theory and Practice of Banking. By HENRY DUNNING MACLEOD, M.A. Fourth Edition. Two vols. London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer. 1883-86.

THIS accurate and scientific work is worthy of the great system of banking, which may be truly said to be the foundation of our commercial prosperity. As a subdivision of Economics, the subject is expounded with singular clearness; while those branches of mercantile law, and they are neither few nor simple, which are incidentally discussed are treated with conspicuous ability. But Economics and Law are not, in their strictly scientific aspects, attractive to general readers. We can, however, promise them also much that is entertaining as well as instructive in even a casual perusal of these volumes. Take, for example, the enumeration at vol. i. p. 40, of the different substances used as money. The reader is, of course, prepared to find metals of every kind and in various shapes, shells also, and carved pebbles, but he will possibly be surprised to learn that the important functions of a circulating medium have been discharged by blocks of compressed tea in Thibet, by dried cod in Newfoundland, by sugar in the West Indies, and by tobacco in Virginia. Nails, he tells us, on the authority of Smith, were used as money in a village in Scotland; while a savage people, untroubled by theories of bimetallism, used cowries for small change and the skulls of their enemies for larger sums!

The history of banking, occupying the last chapter of the first, and nearly half the second, volume, is written with clearness and spirit, and is full of interest for every one. We may mention particularly the conflict between the South Sea Company and the Bank (p. 496) as an exciting incident admirably narrated. To those who wish to understand the mechanism of a system which every one uses in daily life, we have much pleasure in recommending this excellent treatise.

Nature and the Bible. Lectures on the Mosaic History of Creation in its Relation to Natural Science. By Dr. FR. H. REUSCH. Revised and corrected by the Author. Translated from the Fourth Edition by KATHLEEN LYTTLETON. Two vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1886.

ON the title-page of this translation, Dr. Reusch is described as "Professor of Catholic Theology in the University of Bonn." Whether this is taken from the German of the last edition or not, it is more than an unmeaning title now for a man who broke with the Catholic Church in the "Old Catholic" secession, who still unfortunately perseveres in his schism, and whose theological lectures since 1870 can have scarcely, and we believe have, in fact, not had a single Catholic student to listen to them. However, the lectures of which this present volume consist, were the work of Dr. Reusch's Catholic days, and although the last edition was published so

recently as 1876, and the present translation has been again revised by him, we do not notice that anything has been added to detract from the long acknowledged excellence and orthodox spirit of the work. "*Bibel und Natur*," has long been a standard book, and we are very glad to see it at last in an English dress; endorsing as we may the translator's opinion, that "the book will be found to be an extremely valuable and learned summary of the teaching of the Church on the relations between science and religion." This, however, on reflection, is scarcely how we should express it; the book is a valuable and learned attempt by a Churchman to harmonize the definite teachings of science and religion—at least so far as the first chapters of Genesis raise disputed points between the two. For all through these volumes, Dr. Reusch is occupied with the Bible account of the Creation of the universe and of man and of the deluge; his object being to show that the teaching of the earliest pages of the Bible is not in conflict with the teaching of the latest pages of God's other book, Nature, so far at least as modern science (astronomy, geology, biology and the rest) has arrived at certain conclusions. The two books have one Author, the infallible Truth, and consequently they must agree; where there are apparent differences or contradictions, they are only the mistaken readings of hasty or ignorant scholars, and time, the growth of knowledge, wider views, will correct them. Thus he writes much in the confident tone and generous spirit of Cardinal Wiseman in his Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion. Nor does he make any effort to show that it is always the natural philosopher, and never, or scarcely ever, the theologian who is at fault. On the contrary, with a wide knowledge of Catholic theology, of the opinions and arguments of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, and of the best apologetic works, and, on the other hand, with a wonderful familiarity with the chief scientific writings of modern *savans*, whether German, French, Italian or English, Dr. Reusch preserves quite a judicial fairness.

In this spirit he inquires into the nature of the Biblical statements in the Mosaic account of creation; he explains in detail, as to natural phenomena, each verse, almost each word, of the first chapter of Genesis; he expounds the various meanings permissible to the theologian as to the "six days," he discusses how far the deluge was universal and how far due to natural causes; he gives an admirably lucid *exposé* of Darwin's teaching, and inquires as to man's place in the animal system, and the original unity of the human race. Indeed, the reader will find that the learned professor boldly faces every difficulty that he can find has been raised in connection with the early Scripture records, and his inquiry is always pursued with that completeness, wealth of reading and patient minuteness of detail—and with some of the dulness—characteristic of German research.

It would take us too long to go over the points that have occupied public attention lately, and give Dr. Reusch's views. Besides, his book has been too long well known and too frequently quoted. We

have only to introduce the English translation, which is carefully and remarkably well done, adding easily, distinctly and without a jar that we have noticed. Nay, but for the wealth of German works referred to in the notes, the book might be read without suspicion of its origin. Indeed, the Hon. Mrs. Lyttleton has manifestly expended great pains on her translation and she deserves warm thanks. She does not wish to be considered as agreeing with all the author's opinions, or with all his arguments—notably, where he deals with the Theory of Descent; but it is not to be expected that any one, even of his readers, will agree with Dr. Reusch in everything. Yet for the most part Dr. Reusch avoids committing himself uncompromisingly to theories, and is very moderate in the tone of his assertions. He maintains definitely, however, that the theory of the genealogical connection of man and beast is not a scientific conclusion, and he replies at length to Hæckel. The specific unity of the human race, he contends, is certainly proved, but as to whether, further, the race is descended from only one pair of ancestors, he is content chiefly to insist on the point that science has not and cannot prove this to be impossible. Generally his method is to show how far the various divergent theories may each agree with revealed teaching—so, *e.g.*, with the varying interpretations of the six days; though he decides, for himself, against a literal interpretation of them.

This translation of Dr. Reusch is one of the most useful and valuable of the Messrs. Clark's recent publications, and we must thank those enterprising publishers for it. It is a popularly written book (being a course of Lectures) on a topic, or rather a branch of topics, of such constantly recurring discussion and intrinsic interest, that we earnestly recommend it to laymen no less than to the student of theology. The large clear type of the volumes make them pleasant to read, whilst a copious index renders consultation easy: and these are points of no small importance in a standard work of reference. The following passage, which explains itself, is the conclusion of the book, and may suffice as a specimen of the translator's efficiency:—

When the results of geological inquiry were first compared with the Mosaic Hexæmeron, the former seemed to confirm the latter in an accurate and remarkable manner, and the fossils gave irrefutable proofs of the Deluge. But after this first period of harmony between theologians and geologists, there followed another period of bitter enmity; the former geological theories were found to be untenable, and the newly obtained geological results seemed to be in hopeless contradiction with the Bible. Now we are living in the third, and to all appearance, the last period, one of honourable peace; theologians do not claim to find in the results of geological inquiry a striking confirmation of the Biblical record, but they can prove that these results in no way contradict the statements of the Bible when these are rightly understood. The boundaries of both sciences have been now fixed; this was omitted or was probably impossible before; but it has been shown that if the two sciences will meet each other openly, the boundaries and limits of both can be decided in a manner satisfactory to both.

I think the question of the antiquity of mankind will have a similar fate. Cuvier and his followers thought they had found geological proofs of the accuracy of the Biblical chronology: that was the first period. Their views proved erroneous, and we are now living in the second period, in which there seems to be hopeless contradiction between the theories of geologists and not only the Biblical statements, but also the views on the antiquity of the human race held by historians and believed to be admissible by exegetes. May we not expect in this case also a third period, in which the progress of research will show that although we must not expect geology to confirm the so-called Biblical chronology, geologists will not be able to dispute the chronology which is historically vouched for and admitted by the Bible?

At all events we, as true Christians, know that all contradictions between nature and the Bible are only apparent, and are caused by the mistakes of men of science or of exegetes, and that although learned men may not yet have succeeded in removing these apparent contradictions, yet the teaching of the earth's strata can never really gainsay that which is gathered from the leaves of the Bible.

History of Interpretation. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the Year 1885 on the Foundation of the late Rev. J. Bampton. By FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THIS book is like most of Archdeacon Farrar's works—a mass of erudite matter rhetorically worked up. By a history of interpretation Dr. Farrar means a biographical notice of the chief interpreters of Sacred Scripture, classified in various schools. The author purposely excludes from his work any treatment of theories of inspiration or systems of interpretation. And yet it is manifest that the value of Dr. Farrar's work as an historian of interpretation must be largely affected by his own particular views of inspiration and interpretation. The reader will then naturally seek to gather from incidental remarks and general tone what Dr. Farrar's real position is in regard to these vital points. Dr. Farrar is supposed to belong to that "branch" of the Anglican Church which is distinguished by "breadth;" to use the words he applies to another member of that branch, he is "one of those moderate divines abusively called Latitudinarian." Hence it is not surprising to find that he has low, or rather he would prefer to call them, broad views of inspiration. Sacred Scripture "contains"—not *is*—the word of God. Inspiration is not plenary—that is, extending to all its parts—nor does it imply anything like infallibility. St. Austin's difficulty about the admixture of error with what is inspired does not trouble Dr. Farrar. In his view inspired writers were no more preserved from error than from ill-temper:

Inspiration can only be confused with verbal infallibility by ignoring the most obvious facts of language and history. Christ only is the truth. He alone is free from all error (p. xxiii.).

Then, too, as an interpreter Dr. Farrar is thoroughly Protestant;

he admits only one sense in Scripture, and that the literal, which is to be interpreted by private judgment. His grand principle of exegesis is that the "Bible is to be interpreted like any other book." It is not surprising that with such ideas Dr. Farrar should describe the history of interpretation as truly "melancholy"—a record of the "aberrations" of well-meaning but ignorant men. It is no wonder that the Fathers and schoolmen are condemned, while Luther and Calvin are extolled. Great Catholic commentators like Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Maldonat, and Calmet are passed by without a word. History written on such lines must necessarily be imperfect and unfair to the Catholic Church. In treating of modern theories Dr. Farrar, after the manner of his school, has a provoking facility for running with the hare of orthodoxy and hunting with the hounds of advanced criticism. Whilst we condemn the book as a history, we willingly admit that it contains much that is interesting, and that the notes are a mine of valuable information. One cannot but remark how changed are the fortunes of the Septuagint version. Once it was thought to have had a miraculous origin, and to have been an inspired translation. It was the Bible of the Fathers, the Vulgate of the early Church. Now it is accounted simply as a Greek Targum, the work of different interpreters at different times, and of most unequal merit. How changed, too, is the whole spirit of exegesis! Ancient interpreters, regarding the sacred writers as passive instruments of the Holy Spirit, ignored the human element and abounded in the mystical sense. Moderns too often ignore the divine, and refuse to rise above the dull level of human literalism. To the ancients inspiration was identical with revelation, and its language was that of verbal dictation from above. To many moderns it is little more than a partial preservation from error in regard to faith and morals, and its language is but the tongues of men. It is a comfort to find that in the falsehood of extremes eighteenth century Protestants went beyond anything found in Catholic writers. Bibliolatry then became the Protestant cultus, and the divinity of Hebrew vowel points a Protestant dogma. It is pleasing to notice in Dr. Farrar's eighth lecture the utter collapse of some schools of biblical rationalism. This cannot be better described than in the quoted words of Meyer:—

We older men [he said] have seen the day when Dr. Paulus and his devices were in vogue; he died without leaving a disciple behind him. We passed through the tempest raised by Strauss, and with what a sense of solitariness might its author now celebrate his jubilee! We saw the constellation of Tübingen arise, and even before Baur had departed its lustre had waned. A firmer basis and a more complete apprehension of the truth were the blessings which these waves left behind them (p. 418).

At the close of his fifth lecture Dr. Farrar seems to be troubled with some remorse for the depreciatory tone in which he had spoken of the biblical labours of the schoolmen; for he says that "it is

always an evil to create any discontinuity between ourselves and the past." And he seeks to make amends by saying :

Nothing can be more beautiful than the character and example of many of the schoolmen, nothing keener than their intellectual subtlety, nothing more admirable than their unwearied diligence. . . . If they had left nothing else to the Church, they have left the best of all legacies—the legacy of holy lives and an immortal example; the legacy of men who during years of unselfish sincerity spurned delights and lived laborious days. The writings of some will be always valuable for the spirit of deep devotion which they breathe, for high moral teaching, for profound philosophical and theological investigation. But their lives were better than their learning (p. 301).

The Castle of Coëtquen ; or, Patira. Translated from the French of
RAOUL DE NAVERY by A. W. CHETWODE. Dublin : M. H.
Gill & Son. 1886.

M RAOUL DE NAVERY'S stories of adventure and mystery are very popular amongst French Catholic readers. Several of them have already appeared in an English dress, and we welcome the latest of these translations, "The Castle of Coëtquen," as a useful addition to our lighter Catholic literature. The scene of the story is laid in Brittany; it is brightly told, and full of stirring events that carry on the reader's interest to the end. The translator's work has been done exceedingly well. There are very few sentences that suggest the idiom of the original.

The Choice of Books and other Literary Essays. By FREDERIC
HARRISON. London : Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THIS is a charming volume, dealing solely with books, art, and history. The essays are not all new; the larger part of the one on books, for instance, and the whole of that on St. Bernard, are now published for the first time, but the remainder of the volume, comprising papers on "Culture," Froude's "Life of Carlyle," "The Life of George Eliot," "Historic London," "The Æsthete," and others, is reprinted from contemporary reviews. If Mr. Harrison had given us only the delightful chapters on books, we should have had abundant cause to be grateful to him. They are full of evidences of extensive reading and careful analysis, and generally of both mature judgment and good taste. In this age of steam-printing and rapid book-making there is great danger of the unguided reader taking his books much at random, and because they are there, and of thus imbibing much that is useless, and even prejudicial. Mr. Frederic Harrison here offers himself as a guide; and there are probably, at least from a literary point of view, few men of our generation better fitted to guide. He here says much,

and says it well, on the choice of books. Trivial and trashy books are to be passed by, and the "great books" of the world—books into which great minds have poured their riches, are to be chosen. Garbage is to be avoided, and only wholesome food, fit for man's high intellectual nature, to be sought for and valued. With these excellent principles we cordially agree; and we not seldom agree also with Mr. Harrison in his estimate by them of particular books. There are several of the miscellaneous essays in the volume which we have read with pleasure; the one in which the author inveighs against the present mania for pedantic re-spelling of familiar names is as amusing as it is sensible. There is one, a singularly beautiful essay, which we must at least name—the one on "St. Bernard of Clairvaux: a Type of the Twelfth Century." St. Bernard, the gentle ascetic, the pure-minded monk, the warm-hearted friend, the eloquent, fascinating preacher, has taken captive the heart and imagination of Mr. Harrison; and he writes of this Catholic saint with enthusiastic admiration. To any one who can respond to the united charm of culture, refined taste, and the melody of beautiful English writing, the perusal of many of these essays will be a real enjoyment.

A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. By EMIL SCHÜRER, Professor of Theology in the University of Giessen. Translated by SOPHIA TAYLOR and the Rev. P. CHRISTIE. Vol. III. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1886.

WE gladly welcome the publication of the third volume of this most valuable work. This volume gives the fullest information about the literature current in Palestine about the time of Christ. How useful such information is to the Scripture student goes without saying. The Book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses, quoted in St. Jude's Epistle, have a strange history. The former was lost to the world for nearly a thousand years, and then was found in Abyssinia by Bruce in 1773. The latter we owe to the eminent Dr. Ceriani, who discovered an old Latin version in the Ambrosian Library at Milan in 1861. Before this discovery the work was known only from fragments and quotations in the Fathers. Professor Schürer discusses the question of the existence of Maccabean Psalms. He claims "a wide consensus of opinion" in favour of the view that at least four Psalms (43, 76, 78, and 82). "The real point at issue is," he says "not whether there are any such Psalms at all, but only how many of them there are. But the bearing of the whole question on the Jewish Canon he does not discuss. Both Judith and Tobias are referred to the Maccabean age. All historic truth is denied to them; they are simply hortatory narratives with a moral purpose. The Book of Daniel, too, is accounted by Dr. Schürer as "pseudepigraphic," the work of an anonymous writer in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The opinion is, he says, held "by all expositors of the present day—that is, by all

who are not hampered by dogmatic predilection." It is disappointing to find that Dr. Schürer ignores alike Dr. Pusey's learned defence of Daniel and the discoveries of Assyriologists, which at the lowest estimate prove that Daniel could not have been written in the Maccabean age.

St. Paul the Author of the last Twelve Verses of the Second Gospel. By HOWARD HEBER EVANS, B.A. London: J. Nisbet. 1886.

REALLY Mr. Evans is to be congratulated on attaining a distinction much sought after by scholars; we mean, of course, the honour of making an original discovery. That St. Paul had some sort of connection with St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts was suspected by some, even before Mr. Evans set himself to prove that the real author was St. Paul. But we feel sure that no one, not even Dean Burgon himself, the learned defender of the last twelve verses of St. Mark, had the slightest idea that these verses are really the Postscript to the Second Gospel added by St. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles. It is not easy to convey to our readers the full force of Mr. Evans's arguments in support of his amazing conclusion. First we learn from his letter to Timothy that inasmuch as he sent for books and parchments "St. Paul was planning some literary undertaking." That he asks also for St. Mark; that he had both "the needful authority" and "the literary ability" to compose the verses. Again, as Mr. Evans triumphantly asks, "who could write as naturally about taking up serpents without suffering injury (Mark xvi. 17), as St. Paul, who, after his shipwreck at Melita, when a viper fastened on his hand, 'shook off the beast into the fire'?" (Acts xxviii. 3-5). But the most ingenious proof is drawn from the connection of St. Paul with Philip's daughter (Acts xxi. 8) who afterwards told Papias about Justus Barsabas and the deadly poison which Barsabas drank without hurt. No doubt they told St. Paul also of this very occurrence. When, then, we find in the last verses of the Second Gospel the words, "if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them," what can be "more natural" than to conclude with Mr. Evans that St. Paul, and no other, was the author?

Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History. By WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Bishop of Chester, &c. &c. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1886.

IN the preface to this volume Dr. Stubbs remarks that "the lectures were written under the pressure of statutory compulsion and against the grain." Much, however, as the public will sympathize with the learned professor in his labours, we fear they will feel grateful for the necessity that has procured for them a volume at once so interesting and instructive. It would be impossible for anyone to read through these lectures and not be struck with

the genuine enthusiasm for historical studies displayed by the author, an enthusiasm that seems to develop and intensify, rather than diminish, as time goes on. Thorough mastery of the subject, minute knowledge of detail, and, at the same time, sound judgment in arranging and drawing conclusions from the numerous facts to be considered, are evident in every page of the volume.

It would be out of our power, within the limits of a short review, to do anything more than give a faint outline of the subject matter of these lectures, especially as they have no necessary connection with one another, and are not devoted to any single period of history. We propose, however, to discuss briefly one or two questions concerning the volume as a whole, and then to notice some points in the lectures with which we have been particularly struck.

Glancing through the volume before us, we observe that some of the lectures are devoted to questions connected with historical studies in general. Thus, the first four lectures discuss the present position of historical studies, especially at Oxford. They lay down general principles as to how these studies ought to be conducted; what ought to be aimed at, and what avoided in their prosecution, and finally the benefits to be derived from the study of history. The remaining lectures treat of various historical questions; and enter into many interesting details upon special periods of history. The ninth and tenth lectures discuss the characteristic difference between mediæval and modern history; and, as Dr. Stubbs (insisting, as he does, over and over again, upon the importance of the study of history to develop that faculty of the mind we call judgment) considers that the study of mediæval is more fitting than the study of modern history, it may not be uninteresting to see where he draws the line between these two periods, and in what he considers they differ from one another.

Speaking of the reign of Henry VII., he says :

It is the beginning of modern as distinguished from mediæval history; it exhibits in their first definite and specialized forms, the forces that constitute the dramatic elements of the state of society in which we are living; the great powers in their newly consolidated condition, the balance of which makes up European history ever since.—Lect. xv. p. 334.

The learned professor therefore draws the line between mediæval and modern history at the reign of Henry VII. But furthermore he considers that these periods may be distinguished from one another by certain characteristic differences.

Mediæval history [he says] is a history of rights and wrongs. Modern history, as contrasted with mediæval history, divides itself into two portions: the first a history of powers, forces, and dynasties; the second a history in which ideas take the place both of rights and forces. The point of time at which we should mark the separation in the latter is the first French Revolution."—Lect. ix. p. 209.

It seems to us that no unprejudiced student of the history of the Middle Ages can fail to perceive the deep hold the ideas of right

and wrong had upon men's minds. Wars and civil strife were frequent enough; but then, however unjustifiable in many cases they may appear to have been, we can always point to some well-known and recognized principle of law upon which they were based. When Edward III. entered upon his tedious and finally disastrous war with France, he did so because he declared that, on account of the Salic law, he was lawful king of France. The two great families of York and Lancaster, that deluged England with blood from the time of Henry VI. to the accession of Henry VII., both appealed to their right to the British crown. And so we might multiply instances without number. Not that all the wars of the Middle Ages were just and commendable—many had their origin in fraud, in ambition, and in the desire of the strong to oppress the weak—but that we can recognise a special power that law and right exercised over many minds in those days, urging them to act always with at least a semblance of right on their side.

With the reign of Henry VII., however, things seem gradually to have changed. There were still wars waged upon the plea of justice; nay, more, there were still just wars. But the ideas of right and wrong were no longer in the ascendant. Statesmen had ceased to suppose that law and justice could maintain the peace of Europe, and they aimed at bringing about what is called the balance of power; for it was power and force that then ruled supreme. Diplomacy had become a game between princes and dynasties, which bore fruit in the wars of Louis XIV., in the seven years' war, the thirty years' war, in fact in all the bloodshed that took place down to the end of the last century.

A different principle seems to influence the course of history in our own days. Dr. Stubbs considers that this is a period when ideas take the place of rights and forces. To take an instance, we hear much nowadays about the Russians entering India. This idea is discussed in books and articles; our Indian army is organized in the light of it, our Empire in the East is protected to prevent it; our relations with other powers, our attitude towards Russia herself, our conduct in Egypt, the state of our army and navy, are all influenced and in part guided by this idea. We take this as an instance of what we mean when we say that the course of history in our own time is governed largely by ideas, "and such ideas," as Dr. Stubbs says, "may be that of Russia at Constantinople, of a restored Poland, of a free church in a free state, of universal voluntarism, of scientific frontiers."

Perhaps the most interesting lectures in this volume are two that treat of the reign of Henry VIII. They throw a wonderfully clear light upon the policy of this reign, and paint the character of the king in colours that seem to us to explain the many calamitous events that occurred in it. Dr. Stubbs represents Henry as a great man; no mere puppet of parties, or victim of circumstances, but a man of light and leading, a power of force and forethought, yet a man who would have been much greater and better and more fortunate, if he

had lived for his people and not for himself. Henry was a man of intense self-will, and one who would stop at nothing to accomplish his object. He used his ministers as long as they served his purpose, he learned by degrees his own power only to exercise it; in fact, he was a man who would be himself the source and fountain-head of jurisdiction within his kingdom.

We can do no more than indicate the deeply interesting lectures upon Cyprus, the literature of Henry II.'s reign, the reign of Henry VII., the history of canon law in this country, and recommend our readers, if they wish to gain new and interesting information on these subjects, to read and study this volume for themselves. In conclusion, we may say that the volume before us is worthy of Dr. Stubbs, and we trust that, amidst the labours of his new charge, he will find time to continue his historical studies, and to favour us from time to time with the fruits of his researches.

The Official Baronage of England, showing the Succession, Dignities, and Offices of every Peer from 1066 to 1885; with sixteen hundred illustrations. By JAMES E. DOYLE. Three vols. 4to. (Dukes—Viscounts). London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1886.

THE least commendable feature in Mr. Doyle's work is a title which leads one to expect, on first hearing, a sort of Debrett. A few moments' inspection of these volumes will suffice to dispel any such fancy. Brim full of facts they are indeed, as full of facts as a Lodge or a Burke, but facts of quite a different value and import. This book, indeed, brings to mind involuntarily that vast repertory of the history of France, Père Anselme's "*Histoire généalogique des Pairs et des Officiers de la Couronne*," disburdened, however, to meet practical requirements, of the mass of superincumbent genealogical matter which makes Père Anselme's volumes so large and so tedious to consult. In these modest-looking quartos we have a worthy pendant to the Frenchman's great compilation, and they may keep a good countenance in face of his stately folios; what is more, they are based on sources every whit as trustworthy as those of the *Trésor des Chartes*, now in great measure destroyed, which he was able to consult in its integrity. Happily our own incomparable archives are yet intact, and it is from these that, burying himself for long years, the author has gathered the great bulk of his materials. Mr. Doyle's object is strictly practical. He has not in view the gratification of idle antiquarian curiosity or the ministering to the more or less excusable vain-glory of family pride. His business has been to extract from rolls and records the dry bones of real history, or, to use his own words, "to lay a sure foundation in certain departments for the higher work of the historian and biographer;" to relieve them of endless, often impracticable drudgery, by tracing out the official history of each individual member of the peerage above the rank of baron from the Conquest to the present

day, on evidence of unimpeachable authenticity—viz., the very official documents themselves by which each dignity or office was conferred or taken away. Thus the record of offices and dignities is the “principal and distinctive subject” of the book, justifying the somewhat ill-sounding, but in fact perfectly appropriate, title. Nor is it to be supposed that this account is confined only to posts of dignity and mark; nothing is too slight, if the office be a public one, to be overlooked; running from nomination to a justiceship of the peace to the premiership, from the captaincy of “20 men-at-arms and 20 archers,” or the keepership of a castle or forest, to the wardenship of the North or West Marches, the appointment as ambassador to France or the Emperor, or Guardian and Regent of the kingdom. Small matters and great run along thus in odd but just sequence in these pages; the appointment is the thing, whatever be its nature, provided it be public, and its date determines the place of its registration. Curious enough it is to see how many small commodities follow in the wake of great honours, and how devotion to affairs of State is quite compatible with serious attention to matters, in comparison, of infinitely small concern, which bear on private interest and emolument. Take for instance Elizabeth’s favourite, the Earl of Leicester, a name well enough, or ill enough, known in Court annals; after his creation in 1564 he sedulously and steadily gathered up the stewardships or high stewardships of the Honour of Pickering, of the bishopric of Ely, of the Forest of Snowdon, of Harrow, of the bishopric of London, of Reading, of the bishoprics of Coventry and Lichfield and Norwich, of Abingdon, of Bristol, of the bishopric of Bristol, of the Honours of Grafton, of Great Yarmouth, Tewkesbury, Evesham, of the Honour and Lordship of Tickhill, of the Manor and Hundred of Andover, of the archbishopric of York, of St. Albans, of the archbishopric of Canterbury—but we must stop; the rest of the keeperships, chamberlaincies, recordships, may be seen in the work itself. The accumulation of great dignities and high offices is not less surprising; no words of description can give so striking an idea of his great position and influence as the utterly dry enumeration in Mr. Doyle’s pages. In significant contrast with this is the record of his compeer, and, in some measure, rival, Ratcliffe, Earl of Sussex, “a goodly gentleman;” a record of high dignities, yet strictly dignities of duty and of trust. Apart altogether from its character as a help to the student and inquirer, many a page of English history is presented in this baronage, in outline more clear, in a way more telling than in the elaborated picture of the professed historian.

In a book so bristling with detail, much depends on arrangement and the mere mechanical means taken to make reference easy; in these busy days a book to be consulted must yield up its information readily. This Mr. Doyle, in the thoroughly practical spirit in which he has conceived his whole undertaking, has thoroughly understood; new lines, capital letters, spaces, italics, have all been calculated for, and if any difficulty be experienced in finding what is wanted, the

fault does not lie at the door of the author. But even in pursuit of the strictly useful, the agreeable has not been lost sight of. The work bears such evident signs of being exhaustive that we are perfectly willing to believe that the attempt here made to collect a complete body of information concerning the armorial bearings, crests, supporters, badges, colours of the mediæval baronage, has been successful. But passing over this condescension to the weakness of human vanity in a display of the mysteries in which the genealogist and herald delight, mysteries which the author takes care to expound with all the seriousness of a hardened antiquary, we pass readily to a matter which those the least versed in severe historical studies will not be slow to appreciate. True to the idea of "contributing, for the benefit of those who are interested in the history of this country, some aid which may enable them the more readily to turn names into persons" and living realities, Mr. Doyle presents us with a historic portrait gallery, taken from the best originals extant, scanty, of course, as regards the earlier period, and as authentic as the nature of the sources—manuscripts, illuminations of monumental effigies, seals—will allow. There are representations which can hardly lay claim to be in any but a very loose sense likenesses; but, as is justly remarked, what remains "is to make use of the only materials that exist for the purpose of getting as near the truth as is now possible." For the post-mediæval period such material is abundant and reliable, and the plan has been adopted of "giving a portrait in all cases where it can be procured, gradually diminishing the number as our own times are approached." Finally, facsimiles of signatures come opportunely to supplement, some may say help to interpret, the drawings.

It will be seen how great a boon has been here conferred on the historical student; and it remains to express a fervent hope that the author, who has at length produced some of the results of long years of toil, may be spared to complete his task, and render every one interested in English history still further his debtor by producing also an official Baronage of the Barons.

The Letters of Cassiodorus; being a Condensed Translation of the "Variæ Epistolæ" of Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus, Senator. With an Introduction. By THOMAS HODGKIN, Fellow of University College. London: Henry Frowde. 1886.

EVERY student of the history of the later Latin Empire is familiar with the twelve books of the "Variæ Epistolæ" of Cassiodorus, as the principal source of information upon the interesting reign of Theodoric, "Gothorum Romanorumque Rex," as he proudly styles himself. It is quite possible that, meeting with them as "Variæ Cassiod," he may remain quite ignorant of their nature. Certainly, though they have been used fairly and successfully in the extraction of the broad facts, and in the principal deductions to be drawn from

them, it is quite impossible that any one could arrive at an appreciation of the character of the writer without an acquaintance with the letters themselves. Few would suspect that throughout this luxuriant official utterance and diplomatic form, there is diffused a personality which gradually disengages itself, and with ever-increasing attraction fills us with admiration and with suspicion by turns. Mr. Hodgkin, the translator, offers his book to the student of history; doubtless such a one will still find matter for investigation, and will bring fresh gleanings from a much-laboured field; but he must have a dull sensibility who does not feel as he peruses these letters, that while the historic interest gathers round the lordly brow of Theodoric, the human interest looks out from the shrewd and not unkindly features of his minister.

Nothing stands out more clearly from a perusal of these letters than that the object of the whole reign of Theodoric was to fuse together old and new, to break down the fear of Roman for Goth, and the contempt of Goth for Roman. What is more interesting, is to see with what penetration and foresight, with what liberality of mind and fertility of diplomatic resource, he worked for this end. With the crown of Italy, Theodoric seems to have put on the whole Roman spirit and tradition, and under its inspiration to have laboured with energy and persistence throughout a reign of thirty-three years, of which thirty were years of fruitful peace. To gauge the difficulty of the task which Theodoric undertook, it will be sufficient to take the word "*Tertiar*," and, with the aid of the excellent index of Mr. Hodgkin's book, to follow up the correspondence bearing upon the administration of this tax. No more crucial test could be applied, as the tax known as *Tertiar* was demanded from every Roman who held any portion of that third of the land divided among the Goths by Theodoric in right of conquest. As might be conceived, such an imposition was sorely trying to the Romans, and a source of much anxiety to the administrators. It will be seen from the Letters that not only was this tax administered with the strictest equity, but that every precaution was taken to avoid friction, and the feelings of the taxed were most carefully considered.

A very useful section of the *Variae* to the student of history is that which contains the forms of appointment to the various offices of the State. Accompanied as they are with a little homily on the duties of the office, and paternal advice as to their undertaking, they give a good picture of the scheme of civil government, and no little insight into the state of society of the day. The value of this portion is enhanced by an ample treatise on the official hierarchy of the later Empire, forming portion of the translator's introduction to the Letters. This, together with an exhaustive index, makes his book a valuable source of reference for the period to which it belongs.

The first perusal of the Letters by one not prepossessed with some special purpose will be one of pleased and growing wonder. There is sufficient variety of subject to carry the interest to the end.

Probably, after the special charm of the Letters has been detected, there will be a neglect of the more technical details, and those passages will be lingered over which are most stamped with that charm. Many things go to compose it. Given a Polonius with a rare experience of men and things, a confidence acquired by long years of office, a diffuseness which feels itself authorized by the royal character which it personates, and the result is a delightful prêchi-prêcha on all subjects and occasions. He feels that the character in which he speaks requires omniscience. There must be no mystery for him, mystery implies weakness. No occasion seems to him unsuited for the display of his encyclopædic knowledge. Indeed he openly avows his intention of saying something *recherché*, and prefaces a wonderful story of the cranes and the alphabet with the following flourish :—" *ut aliquid studiose exquisitum dicere videamur*" (bk. viii. let. 12). He is never afraid that his correspondent may find his information superfluous. If a dispute arises as to boundaries, the disputants are exhorted to careful investigation by the consideration that "geometry was discovered by the Chaldeans." He does not hesitate, in the formula for the appointment of the Architect of the Palace, an official whom we might expect to know at least the rudiments of his profession, to exhort him to "study Euclid; get diagrams well into your mind; study Archimedes and Metrobius" (bk. vii. let. 5). Amusing situations sometimes arise from the absence of a sense of humour. Many interesting pictures of domestic and public life are given. We learn, for instance, that the milk-cure for consumptives was in vogue even in those days (bk. xi. let. 10); and modern travellers may derive some consolation from the knowledge that the officials and innkeepers along the Flaminian Way, even in the sixth century, were little better than a band of robbers (bk. xi. let. 12).

It is not easy to judge of the style of the original from Mr. Hodgkin's version. The Letters are liberally condensed, and there results a general freedom of style which is wanting in the original. The Latin is always laboured in narrative and description, although in exhortation it is sometimes terse and epigrammatic. In these latter cases the translator is not always happy. The admonition given to an official that, "*Pio principi sub quodam sacerdotio serviatur*," is lamely rendered by, "A sort of holiness is required from those who hold office under a righteous king" (bk. i. let. 2). One obvious blunder occurs in his rendering of the phrase "*dies sacræ noctis*," which, connected as it is with the solemn administration of baptism, obviously refers to Holy Saturday. This the translator, misled by a previous allusion to the feast of St. Cyprian, takes as the vigil of that feast. Less pardonable is the stricture passed on the Maurist editor of Cassiodorus, Dom Garet, which he goes out of his way to introduce (bk. viii. let. 37, p. 216). The Letter is to a Bishop, inciting him to the fulfilment of justice in a case in which the Bishop himself was implicated. He is admonished that it is better for him to inquire and to put the matter right

himself, than to allow the case to be brought before the secular courts. The translator prefaces the Letter with the remark—"Observe how the marginal note (in the edition of the Benedictine Garet) strains the doctrine of this Letter in favour of the clergy." The marginal note is as follows: "*Causæ sacerdotum a sacerdotibus debeat terminari.*" We will give the sentence of Cassiodorus against which it is placed, and also Mr. Hodgkin's paraphrase, and the reader shall judge for himself which interpretation puts most strain on the original. The Latin is—"Quoniam causarum vestrarum qualitas vobis debet iudicibus terminari, a quo est spectanda magis, quam imponenda iustitia." The note of Dom Garet is almost a verbal repetition of the first clause of this sentence. The only portion of Mr. Hodgkin's summary which can be taken to represent the sentence of the original is as follows: "As it is proper that causes which concern you should first be remitted to you (so often employed as judges to settle the disputes of others), we called upon you, &c." The fact is that Mr. Hodgkin is led into an *ignis-fatuus* dance by Dahn's "*Könige der Germanen*" whenever anything seems to favour the immunity of the clergy from secular jurisdiction. The amount of immunity granted is obvious enough, and is worthy of admiration, even on purely political grounds, in the king of a race unused to hierarchical distinctions in religion. The limit set to this immunity is also plainly set forth in these Letters; and until some commentator denies that limit—which Dom Garet certainly does not in the note—Mr. Hodgkin would do well to try rather to show a better appreciation of the religious tolerance of the Gothic monarch.

Still we have to be grateful for the labours which have given us a compendious and interesting presentation of these Letters. The whole work shows evidence of much research, and of a thorough candour, which, far from hiding its deficiencies, honestly proclaims them, and challenges discussion of its own solutions of difficult passages by offering the original text for comparison.

The Book of Genesis: a Translation from the Hebrew. By F. LENORMANT. Translated from the French with an Introduction and Notes by the Author of "*Mankind, their Origin and Destiny.*" London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1886.

THIS book is somewhat disappointing, as it contains very little of Lenormant and too much of his anonymous translator. Nor is there anything of particular value in Lenormant's translation of Genesis. Certainly it was hardly worth to print it twice over, first, just as it stands in the Massoretic text, and a second time divided in two parts, the Jehovistic and the Elohist. This is somewhat grandiloquently called "a separation of the constituent elements of the text," "an attempted restoration of the original documents used by the latest reviser." It hardly required a Lenormant to do this. No attempt is made to explain the groundwork of the document theory. No notice is taken of those chapters in which both names, Jehovah and

Elohim are united together. The twentieth chapter is a perplexity, and M. Lenormant doubts whether he ought to attribute its authorship to the Elohist, the Jehovist, or the "second Elohist." M. Lenormant's notes are few and brief. The translator has thought good to supplement them with his own annotations without any regard to Lenormant's views elsewhere expressed. Hence one may search in vain throughout the book to find Lenormant's peculiar theories about the Deluge, the ages of the Patriarchs, or the black races. Then, too, the translator has prefixed a lengthy Introduction, containing statements which we are sure that Lenormant, as a Catholic, would never have approved. In conclusion, it may be of interest to notice one or two of M. Lenormant's special renderings of the Hebrew. "And Elôhîm said, Let the waters swarm with a living pullulation" (Gen. i. 20). "The sceptre shall not depart from Yehûdah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until he come to Shîloh." (Gen. xlix. 9). To this, in a note, he adds that this is the meaning of the text according to the grammatical construction, but that the interpretation of the prophecy is still the *crux* of commentators.

Our Administration of India. Being a Complete Account of the Revenue and Collectorate Administration in all Departments, with special reference to the Work and Duties of a District Officer in Bengal. By H. A. D. PHILLIPS, Bengal Civil Service, author of "Manual of Indian Criminal Law," &c. London: Thacker & Co.

MR. PHILLIPS is already known to our readers by an article which appeared in the DUBLIN REVIEW for July, 1885, and now forms part of the present volume. He is a thorough believer in the excellence of British rule, and his book is a "vindication of Indian administration from the attacks of pessimist detractors," such as "the imaginative crew of Hyndmans, Osbornes, Blunts, *et hoc genus omne*." There are certainly few countries so well governed as India. The British official is always a man of ability, and is anxious to rule the natives justly. The amount of work he gets through puts to shame the labours of his brethren in England.

The crack collector, man of equal might,
Reports all day, and corresponds all night.

And what is his reward?

Beneath the glamour of the East behold a young English lad, full of health, and hope, and heart, who has complacently sold his birthright for voluntary exile. His youth, his manhood, his (premature) age are bartered for a moderate income of money, a career which involves existence in a detestable and enervating climate, a life which brings with it the laceration of every domestic feeling, and the enforced separation from every home influence intended to soothe, to soften, and to ameliorate man's nature.—*New India*, by H. J. S. Cotton, quoted by Mr. Phillips.

No wonder that the officials warmly resent the attacks made upon

them by the natives and their sympathizers at home. Mr. Phillips complains of "the disgraceful licence and disloyalty of the native press. Nothing but extracts could give the English reader any idea of its slanderous imputations, its deliberate falsehoods, its rabid virulence, and its rank sedition. . . . Sometimes articles appear almost, if not quite, as bad as the worst utterances of the worst Irish papers." Perhaps this last allusion suggests the reason for these attacks. The Hindu's real grievance is not that the administration is bad, but that it comes to them in a foreign garb. If England were mapped out into "Regulation Districts," presided over by German "Magistrate-Collectors," the work of government would be carried on far more efficiently than at present. Nevertheless, "articles almost, if not quite, as bad as the worst utterances of the worst Irish papers" would appear in the English papers. The bitterest Tory would rather be misgoverned by Mr. Gladstone than governed by Prince Bismarck. But it must not be imagined that Mr. Phillips is wanting in sympathy with the natives. His treatment of the land question disproves this, and is, perhaps, the best part of his book. The following extract will give the reader some idea of his method:—

The land question in India has been satisfactorily solved, and presents a striking contrast to the state of the same question in England, Scotland, or even Ireland. The legal basis of recent land legislation in Ireland is, as in Prussia, the recognition of the fact that prescriptive possession, even under a title of mere tenancy, confers a right to continuance of such possession. The same principle, with the addition of the words "at a fair judicial rent," has been thoroughly recognized and acted upon in India. . . . This principle formed the basis of the conversion of copyholds in England from being tenancies at will into tenancies in perpetuity, and should be applied to check the system of "clearances" in the Highlands, where the right of the crofters to continue in possession rests on the original community of possession by the tribe, and is fortified by an almost immemorial continuance of possession by each family. Immense areas have been, and are being, converted into grouse-shootings, deer-forests, &c., a process which involves the removal of the small tenantry, and, in some cases, even puts a stop to grazing of cattle or sheep. The landowners find the game rents more profitable than the farming rents; but the nation suffers a diminution in the employment of labour and in the production of food. To do Hindu landlords justice, it may be remarked that, whatever their other failings may be, such ejections would be utterly repugnant to their ideas and feelings. As for Indian revenue officers, whether sportsmen or no sportsmen, and whatever may be their previous leanings, predilections, and politics, their life, training, and surroundings are such that they cannot but keenly sympathize with the fullest extension of tenancy right. A right to continue in possession at a fair rent is the basis, the prop, the very essence and *sine quâ non* of agricultural life in India. It would be well for the mother country if in this respect she were as far advanced as her Indian dependency (pp. 39, 40).

Mr. Phillips dedicates his work to Lord Randolph Churchill, "in recognition of his interest in India and solicitude for the welfare of two hundred million British Indian subjects."

T. B. SCANNELL.

The Sacred Books of the East. Vol. XXV.: "The Laws of Manu." Translated, with Extracts from Seven Commentaries, by G. BÜHLER. Vol. XXIX.: "The Grihya-sûtras: Rules of Vedic Domestic Ceremonies." Translated by HERMANN OLDENBERG. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1886.

THE translations published by the Clarendon Press under the general title of "The Sacred Books of the East" are of very various degrees of merit. Professor Whitney has lately shown, in the *American Journal of Philology*, that Professor. Max Müller's two volumes of versions from the Upanishads ("Sacred Books," vols. i. and xiv.) are far from being satisfactory interpretations of the original texts. In the pages of this review Professor De Harlez published some time ago a very severe criticism of M. J. Darmesteter's translation of the *Vendidad* ("Sacred Books," vol. iv.). The best Arabic scholars do not accept the late Professor Palmer's Introduction to the Koran ("Sacred Books," vol. vi.) as representing the view of the most competent authorities on the subject; and in another of the introductions ("Sacred Books," vol. viii.) the translator puts forward an untenable view on the date of the *Bhagavad-gîtâ*. On the other hand, the series contains much excellent work. Professor Bühler's version of "The Laws of Manu," one of the latest volumes issued from the Clarendon Press, is a work of sterling merit. There is a very full introductory essay, and the translation is accompanied by a long series of extracts from the best native commentaries.

"The Laws of Manu" form one of the most important works in the whole circle of Sanskrit literature. It presents a picture—probably in many points an ideal rather than a real picture—of the Brahmanical organization of Indian society some eighteen centuries ago. Until comparatively recently the native estimate of the age of Manu was accepted by European scholars, and it was spoken of as a work dating from a period of two or even four thousand years before Christ. It is now regarded as a comparatively modern recast of a more ancient work. The very language in which it is written forbids us to throw it back into the earlier ages of Aryan development in India, or to regard it as representing the primitive organization of the race which produced it, though of course, like all ancient codes, it abounds in vestiges of a time much earlier than that in which it was composed. Authors who, like Père Thébaud, appeal to Manu as if it were one of the earliest monuments of our race, are very strangely in error.

Dr. Oldenberg's volume of "Grihya-sûtras" contains four of those curious codes of Hindu domestic ceremonies. A second volume is promised, with a general introduction to the whole collection. The "Grihya-sûtras" are of interest as showing how religion in India is made to penetrate into every phase of family life, each having its own ceremonial, of which, as a rule, the father is the high priest. The greater part of these ceremonies do not rise much above the level of

traditional charms and spells, but the underlying idea of worship sometimes comes out in a very striking way, as when Âsvalâyana says: "Even he who only puts a piece of wood on the fire full of belief, should think, 'Here I offer a sacrifice, adoration to that deity.'"

Future Probation. A Symposium on the Question, "Is Salvation Possible after Death?" London: Nisbet & Co.

THE "papers" which make up this book have already appeared in the *Homiletic Magazine*. It is very doubtful, indeed, whether their republication will do any good. It is probable, rather, that they will only help to spread the more that disbelief in the eternity of hell which is readily taken up by a sinning generation. They will aid in the propagation of the heresy so lately revived, or at least in a great measure popularized, by that tinselly, rationalizing, and untrustworthy writer, Archdeacon Farrar. It is true that one of these "papers" is by a clear-headed theologian, Bishop Weathers, in which he gives a lucid exposition of the Catholic doctrine, and this may somewhat counteract the false teaching of most of the rest; but error is often more acceptable to fallen human nature than truth.

There are, however, two advantages, from another point of view, of this republication. The first is, that it becomes apparent to any honest inquirer from perusing these "papers," into what a quagmire of confusion theologians outside the Catholic Church inevitably fall, when, without any guide but themselves, they begin to discuss any important religious question. There is evident in the greater number of these writers an ignorance of the real nature of sin, and therefore of the punishment due to it. Among them is Richard Littledale, D.D. He distinguishes himself by differing on this important question from the teaching of the Church of which he is a minister. He ranges himself, of course, on the side opposite to the Catholic Church. He states, at p. 203, that "no dogmatic decree of the universal Church can be produced in support of that (the stricter) view." But is that a proof that this view was not always taught? Dr. Littledale, is evidently not much of a theologian. Is a dogmatic decree necessary for every revealed truth? Has he never heard that a dogmatic decree is not made except to contradict some heretical statement of a truth already taught? There was no dogmatic decree regarding the divinity of Jesus Christ until the fourth century, yet was it not a truth always taught? There are many truths regarding which there have been no dogmatic decrees. Again, he, as well as others, can see no reason why there should not be a "probation" after death. But is it not obvious that after death human nature no longer exists in its completeness? There is only the soul, the separated form. Therefore its acts, whatever they might be, would not be *human* acts. Hence, at death the time for "proving" the *man*—that is, the soul and body united—is over (see

"Summa contra Gentiles," book iii. c. 144.) To Dr. Littledale the idea of this life being a "probation" is quite unacceptable. The reason he gives is rather wonderful. "It suggests," he says, "an untenable analogy, and one out of keeping with full recognition of divine wisdom. For what it in fact implies is that God does not know how he [man] will turn out, and has to watch our conduct in this world before being able to come to a decision as to our final destiny" (p. 209). This is somewhat puerile reasoning, we think. Life may surely be a time of "probation" in the obvious sense of man's will being tried in his choice of good or evil, God well knowing the while the final result. At p. 213 Dr. Littledale speaks in a characteristically coarse and irreverent way of St. Augustine's view of unbaptized infants. At p. 222 he alludes to the "view current in mediæval times," which he misrepresents in his usual masterly manner. No one can trust Dr. Littledale when he speaks of Catholic saints or Catholic doctrines.

The second advantage that may possibly come from the republication of these "papers" is that those who have eyes to see will discern the necessity of having an infallible authorized guide to interpret for men the meaning of the word of God. A number of non-Catholic theologians set to work to give their views about a most important question, and the result is chaos.

Bishop Weathers' article stands apart, clear, logical, coherent, and weighty, because it is the teaching of the Catholic Church.

The Legendary History of the Cross: a Series of Sixty-four Woodcuts from a Dutch book published by Veldener, A.D. 1483, with an Introduction. Written and illustrated by JOHN ASHTON. Preface by S. BARING GOULD, M.A. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1887.

THE series of facsimiles of the old Dutch engravings specified in the title are preceded by a brief narrative of the finding of the true Cross, reproduced for the most part from Caxton's version of the Golden Legend, and of the veneration of the various relics of the holy wood, the account of which is chiefly borrowed from the fine work, "*Les Instruments de la Passion*," of M. Rohault de Fleury, who, after the most minute and indefatigable investigations, believes that the Cross was mainly, if not wholly, of pine-wood. The results of these interesting investigations are briefly summed up. They afford ample refutation of Calvin's assertion that the relics venerated as pieces of the true Cross would freight a ship. M. de Fleury has given descriptions and measurements of all the known relics of the Cross, and computes the total bulk at "3,941,975 cubic millimetres; thus, according to his showing, there is but a very small portion of the Holy Cross in existence." "We are credited in England with 30,516 cubit millimetres of the Holy Cross." The relics are at Isleworth, Downside College, Lord Petre's, St. Mary's, East Bergholt, Plowden Hall, St. Mary's, York, West Grinstead, St. George's, Southwark, St. Richard's, Slindon.

There is a brief account also included in the volume of the title and the nails, and the traditions connected with these relics. The author might have found space, we think, to mention the beautiful tradition or fancy expressed in St. Bonaventure's "Mirror of the Life of Christ," of how St. John carefully hid away the nails in his dress lest they should chance to meet her eyes and sight of them should cause fresh anguish to Our Lady.

The legendary history of the tree destined to be employed for the Cross is also briefly noticed in the volume before us. M. Baring-Gould considers this to be merely a Christian transformation of Northern mythological traditions referring to Yggdrasil, the world ash-tree, whose roots reached to hell and whose branches spread to heaven. However this may be, we agree that the Cross myth—i.e., the legend of the Cross previous to the Crucifixion, has been comparatively little explored and would probably repay study. Mr. Ashton's little book does not pretend to be a serious contribution to such investigation, but it may, perhaps, draw attention to the subject.

-
1. *The First Century of Christianity.* By HOMERSHAM COX, M.A., a Judge of County Courts, Author of "The Institutions of English Government," &c. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1886.
 2. *The Growth of the Church in its Organization and Institutions: being the Croall Lectures for 1886.* By JOHN CUNNINGHAM, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THE study of Christianity may be undertaken from very mixed motives. Some minds may be impelled through curiosity pure and simple to inquire into the most marvellous revolution which human society has ever passed through. Others may seek to discover in ecclesiastical annals a rational ground for the faith which is in them. There can, however, be little doubt that between these two widely divergent classes of Church History students, there exists many a class sharply marked off from its neighbours by the distinct peculiar views of those who compose it. These views need not necessarily be deserving of censure—and even where they are unquestionably faulty, those who hold them may in many instances have contributed valuable stones for the building of the Great Temple of historical truth. These additions to our knowledge of times past must ever command our attention and gratitude. They are proofs of the wonderful providence with which an All-Wise God makes every creature serve to the extension of His Kingdom, and they help to remind many Catholics who waste their leisure and abilities on the frivolous ephemeral literature of the hour, that an inspection of their spiritual title-deeds, a looking over those ancient documents which prove their claim to be "the Children of the Kingdom" ought to possess as much interest for them as for the stranger at their gates.

A Catholic who would supply English readers with a sketch of the

first century somewhat on the lines followed by Mr. Cox, but avoiding his mistakes, would render a great service to his co-religionists. Mr. Cox's book is not without merits of its own; and those of no mean excellence. His style is pleasing, clear and unembarrassed. Order and proportion are generally observed. Authorities are quoted copiously and rendered into easy flowing English, so that the reader is able to judge for himself of the nature and value of their testimony, instead of having to rely upon the *ipse dixit* of the historian. The author has been at pains to verify every reference, and has had the very uncommon frankness to note the circumstance in the very few instances in which he has cited authorities at second hand. Mr. Cox's legal acquirements allow him to throw occasionally light upon some vexed point of ancient law procedure, although the space at his command does not permit him to marshal his arguments in full force. He has evidently weighed the *pros* and *cons* in the discussion over St. Peter's connection with Rome, and devotes a whole chapter to the support of the Catholic side in spite of "Plain Reasons" being against this view. We could wish we had nothing but praise for this interesting work, but two serious defects detract considerably from its value. In the first place, for a writer to draw up even a compendium of the history of early Christianity from which religious and doctrinal topics should be scrupulously excluded is to attempt an impossibility. As well give us the play of Hamlet without the part of the Prince of Denmark, or tell the story of England in the eighteenth century and leave out all mention of the Test Act. Even Mr. Cox could not succeed in a feat of this kind, and at page 68 we find him floundering in the vexed doctrinal question of the Primacy of St. Peter, and the relative positions of St. James and the Prince of the Apostles. A more serious defect, and one that accounts for Mr. Cox's erroneous views on the Primacy and cognate matters, is the omission of our Lord's life from his pages. Even the public ministry of our Divine Saviour is passed over, on what grounds it is hard to conceive. If Mr. Cox had only read Father Coleridge's volume on the Training of the Apostles, he might have acted differently. He would have seen that Christ's mission was not merely religious and doctrinal, but also disciplinary. And had he begun to study the position assigned to St. Peter by the Master, he would have better understood how St. Peter stood with relation to the first bishop of Jerusalem.

This same defect—viz., of supposing that Jesus had no hand in forming the Church, that he left his Apostles without any fixed principles touching the constitution of His Kingdom, and without accustoming them to any habits of discipline or deference to a recognized authority—vitiates the whole of Dr. Cunningham's book, which necessarily goes over the same field that Mr. Cox has explored. The Scottish divine would seem to hold that at our Lord's death all was chaos. Out of this chaos, by laws best understood by enthusiastic evolutionists,

A fabric huge
Rose like an exhalation

and, if we are to take Dr. Cunningham's view, as unsubstantial as changing in form as any cloud. All the parts of this miraculous construction do not present kindred features of style, but the disparity is due solely to environment. Well may the Croall lecturer boast that he has "reversed old-fashioned Church history." His style, we regret to have to say, might with advantage have been purged of "old-fashioned" expressions, which savour more of the "Reformers'" gutter vocabulary than nineteenth-century scholarship. Dr. Cunningham doubtless meant what he said when, in his preface, he promised to speak even of his opponents "without asperity." Nevertheless, the amenities of modern controversy, even as displayed in the columns of the *Church Times*, had hardly prepared us for the survival of the old-fashioned nickname "Mass-mumbling priests." That St. Augustine should with "savage consistency" preach the "inhuman doctrine" of baptismal regeneration has been too much for the worthy professor's resolution, and with all the consistency of an admirer of the amiable John Knox, he speaks to us of "Romish ecclesiastics," sees in exorcisms only "magic and incantations," and cannot withhold his indignation at the way in which neophytes were befooled in the primitive Church. Without asperity and in wailing accents, he depicts the heartless disillusioning that attended baptism. "For years the catechumen had been looking forward to this natal day, and the unveiling of the great mystery, and now, when it was unveiled, he must have felt he was subjected to a disappointment, if not to a cheat. There was nothing but a cold bath, with a ceremonial mainly borrowed from the heathen temples." The severe warning contained in Matt. vii. 6 and the *disciplina arcani* are justified abundantly by language like this. Yet, distressing as it is to read Dr. Cunningham on Baptism, the pain is slight compared with the horror and repugnance with which his pages on the Sacrament of Love must inspire every believer in It.

Books of Devotion and Spiritual Reading.

1. *The Great Means of Salvation and of Perfection. The Incarnation, Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ; or, the Mysteries of Faith.* (Centenary Edition of ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI.) Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.S.S.R. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1887.
2. *A Memoir of Father Felix Joseph Barbelin, S.J.* By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. With Introduction by Rev. IGNATIUS F. HORSTMANN, D.D. Published for the benefit of St. Joseph's Church, Philadelphia. 1886.
3. *Five Minute Sermons for Low Masses.* By Priests of the Congregation of St. Paul. Vol. II. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1886.

4. *Life of Father J. B. M. Champagnat*, Priest and Founder of the Society of the Little Brothers of Mary. By one of his First Disciples. Translated from the French. London: Burns & Oates. 1887.
5. *Sermons at Mass.* By Rev. PATRICK O'KEEFFE, C.C., Author of "Moral Discourses." Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1887.
6. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius.* By ALBANY JAMES CHRISTIE, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1886.
7. *The Life of Brother Paul J. O'Connor.* Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1887.
8. *Quadragesima; or, Short Meditations for Lent and Holy Week.* By a Brother of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1887.
9. *The End of Man.* In Four Books. By ALBANY JAMES CHRISTIE, S.J. Third Edition. London: Burns & Oates. 1886.
10. *Meditations on St. Mary Magdalen.* London: R. Washbourne. 1887.
11. *The Love and Service of Christ in His Poor.* By the BISHOP OF SALFORD. Salford: J. Roberts & Sons. London: J. Donovan, 27 Wellington Street, W.C. 1887.
12. *The Martyrs of England in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth beatified by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.* Taken chiefly from BISHOP CHALLONER. London: Thomas Richardson & Son.
13. *Accessus et recessus Altaris.* Ed. Altera. Friburgi Brisgovie: Herder. 1886.
14. *Server's Missal.* Compiled by a Sacristan. London: Burns & Oates.

1. Two more volumes must be noticed of the English translation of the works of St. Alphonsus now being brought out as a "centenary" homage to the holy Doctor by his children in the United States. The "Great means of Salvation" is the well-known treatise on Prayer, a standard book of ascetical teaching for preachers, for directors, and for the faithful at large. The meditations and devotions on the Incarnation, which make up the other volume, are also familiar to English readers, thanks to the versions edited some thirty years ago by the late Bishop Coffin—whose translation, we observe, is followed word for word in this new issue. All things are common amongst brethren; but, as literary information, it might have been as well to mention this. One note, as far as we have observed, has been added; but, on the other hand, several of the references are omitted. The indices, however, in both volumes are new.

2. From an artistic point of view Miss Donnelly's memoir of a devoted priest leaves something to desire. It is, if the word may be used, noisy, and it is discursive—the production, evidently, of an enthusiastic but an unskilled hand. But it will be liked and read, especially in the circle where Father Barbelin laboured and died. He was a native of Lorraine, and left his native land in 1830 for the United States, where he entered the Society of Jesus. He spent most of his life at the "old church" of St. Joseph, in Philadelphia, and is still affectionately remembered. He died in June, 1864.

3. A second volume of "five minute" sermons by the New York Paulists will no doubt be welcomed by preachers who feel the weight and the heat of recurring Sundays. There are more than 150 admirable short sermons in this little book. Each sermon might serve as a "skeleton" for a much longer discourse; though we have a wholesome dread of that process of amplification which consists mainly in saying two or three times over, more or less weakly, what the author says once very effectively. The Epistle and Gospel are given for each Sunday of the year. The only thing one misses in these addresses is that *affective* turn which is so common in St. Alphonsus.

4. This biography of the Abbé Champagnat, one of the numerous French priests who, during the last half century, have devoted themselves to education, is a translation from the French. Though extremely edifying, it is much more than a book of spiritual reading. It is a serious and able essay on the science and art of the Christian education of children, exemplified in the career of one who gave his life to it. Champagnat was born in the Loire in 1789, and died in 1840. In 1817 he began, at Lavalla, an Institute which was, in 1868, approved by Pope Pius IX. under the name of the "Marist Brothers of the Schools." It was in 1852 that the first brothers of the Congregation came to England, commencing their work in the district of St. Anne's, Spitalfields. Their English novitiate was removed in 1874 to Dumfries. The book is a distinct addition to our educational literature. The facts and information which are gathered in the introduction alone will make it most valuable to all who are interested in the work of catechizing. The numerous list there given of French Congregations of men which have education for their object will surprise the English reader.

5. Father Patrick O'Keeffe has here printed some twenty sermons of six or seven pages each. The book bears the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Dublin.

6. Father Christie's version of the Exercises of St. Ignatius is arranged for an eight days' retreat, and will be found handy for that purpose, and for mental prayer generally.

7. Brother Paul J. O'Connor owes some of his fame to his having had the good luck to act as schoolmaster to Father Tom Burke. But the reader will find in this modest memoir an interesting glimpse of educational and pastoral work in the West of Ireland forty years ago. Brother O'Connor was a leading member of the "Brothers of St. Patrick," a Congregation founded for teaching in elementary schools by Bishop Delaney, of Kildare. Being sent to Galway by Bishop Doyle, he laboured there, till his death, with great zeal and self-denial. His correspondence affords evidence of a serious, solid, and truly pious disposition. He is one of the men to whom Ireland owes the strength and vigour which has enabled her faith to resist a far worse danger than persecution—the flood of American religious radicalism and irreverence which threatened her some twenty years ago.

8. It is not often we have to welcome a book of Catholic devotion

from Messrs. Blackwood, of Edinburgh. The author of these meditations for Lent does not give his name; but they are careful, solid, and devout. They are published with the authorization of the Ordinary.

9. Father Christie has here printed, in a smaller form, a third edition of his metrical version of the Ignatian Exercises.

10. "The following Meditations," says the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, "are solid and practical." We may add that the writer of this little book has known how to make good use not only of the Holy Scriptures, but of the numerous allusions of the Fathers, and especially of St. Gregory the Great, to this blessed penitent. The manual is adapted for use during a novena.

11. In this latest of the Bishop of Salford's "People's Manuals" a Pastoral Letter is followed by seven chapters, in which the Bishop treats of the Catholic view of poverty, the poor in England, the spiritual benefits derived from serving the poor, the need of Catholic workers, and the practical means of working efficiently in behalf of the poor. We need not say that it is full of devout suggestions and of useful advice.

12. Many readers will be glad of this little brochure, in spite of its small print. For those who cannot get the full text of Challoner it will be very serviceable. Its extreme cheapness recommends it for distribution.

13. Herder, of Freiburg, sends what seems to be the second edition of a Latin "preparation and thanksgiving" for priests. It contains all the prayers of the Roman Missal, the chief indulgenced prayers, and a large number of devout formularies. Some priests may find the Latin prayers to their taste; some will not. The Latin of the Missal, of St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Thomas is a genuine language, capable of all that a language can do. But this modern Latin is simply French or German masquerading. We should like to protest against such a form as "Josephe," which occurs many times in these pages. The Vulgate and the liturgical books of the Church rightly treat "Joseph" as indeclinable.

14. A revised edition of Messrs. Burns and Oates' practical guide for boys serving at Mass. It is very difficult to condense rubrics for the guidance of those troublesome young people, our servers. For example, at the Elevation this manual says, "Ring thrice." The rubric of the Roman Missal does not *prescribe* that the bell shall be rung thrice. As a matter of fact, in many places it is rung continuously. But of course the boys must do as the priest tells them.

LIST OF BOOKS RECEIVED

(Many of them too late for review in this number).

"The Throne of the Fisherman Built by the Carpenter's Son." By Thomas W. Allies, K.C.S.G. London: Burns & Oates.

"The Church of the Early Fathers." External History. (Epochs of Church History.) By Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

"The Joy of the Ministry." By the Rev. Frederick R. Wynne, M.A. Second Thousand. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

"The Philosophy of Law." By Immanuel Kant. Translated by W. Hastie, B.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

"Modern Heroes of the Mission Field." By the Right Rev. W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D. Third Thousand. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

"The Epistle to the Ephesians: its Doctrine and Ethics." By R. W. Dale, M.A., LL.D. Third Edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

"Social History of the Races of Mankind." Second Division. Papuo and Malayo Melanesians. By A. Featherman. London: Trübner & Co.

"History of the Irish People." By W. A. O'Connor, B.A. Two vols. Manchester and London: J. Heywood. 1887.

"The Johnsonians." Second Series. By the Author of "The Mysteries of the Rosary," &c. London and New York: Burns & Oates.

"Alexander's Empire." By Professor J. P. Mahaffy, D.D., with the collaboration of Arthur Gilman, M.A. "The Story of the Nations" Series. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

"The Science of Thought." By F. Max Müller. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

"Still Hours." By Richard Rothe. Translated by Jane T. Stoddart. Introductory Essay by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

"Lecture on the Epistle to the Philippians." By John Hutchinson, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

"Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians." By F. Godet. Translated by Rev. A. Cusin, M.A. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

"The Eucharistic Life of Jesus Christ." By M. Jacques Biroat. Translated by E. G. Varnish. With an Introductory Preface by Rev. Arthur Tooth, M.A. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co.

"Histoire Politique de la France." Par C. de Loisne. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie.

"Georges Cadoudal et La Chouannerie." Par son Neveu Georges de Cadoudal. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie.

"Un Gentilhomme des Temps Passés. François de Scépeaux, 1509-1571." Par Madame C. Coignet. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie.

"Christus Consummator." By Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., D.C.L., &c. London: Macmillan & Co.

"The Homiletic Magazine." Vol. XV. July-December, 1886. London: James Nisbet & Co.

"Biblical Commentary on the Psalms." (The Foreign Biblical Commentary.) By Franz Delitzsch, D.D. Translated by the Rev. David Eaton, M.A. Vol. I. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Record of Roman Documents.

BENEDICTINE DECREE, THE.—The Decree of Benedict XIV., published for Holland in 1741, is extended to all the dioceses of the United States, in which the Decree *Tumetsi* of the Council of Trent has not been published. (*S. Rom. et Univ. Inquis. Cong.*, Nov. 25, 1885.) *Vid. Irish Eccles. Record*, March, 1887.

CANONIZATION.—The following are some of those passing through the various stages :—

The Seven Blessed Founders of the Order of the Servites of Mary. Miracles are being authenticated. *Vid. Tablet*, Feb. 26 and March 12, 1887.

Vincent Maria Morelli, of the Theatines, Archbishop of Otranto. Writings declared to offer no obstacle.

Fra Bernard Maria Clausi, of the Missions of S. Francis of Paola. Decree of Urban VIII. *de non cultu* declared to have been observed.

Blessed Humile da Besignano, of the Reformed Friars Minor. Case re-opened.

Fra Modestinus, of Jesus and Mary, of the Alcantarins of Naples. Writings revised, decree *nihil obstat*.

Mgr. Francis de Montmorency-Larol, Bishop of Quebec from 1648 to 1688. Preparations being made for introduction of Cause. For these last five *vid. Tablet*, Jan. 22, 1887.

Venerable Liebermann, Founder of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost and of the Sacred Heart of Mary. *Vid. Tablet*, Jan. 1, 1887.

Blessed Alphonsus Rodriguez of the Society of Jesus. Miracles under consideration. *Vid. Tablet*, Feb. 19, 1887.

Vincent Pallotti, Roman Priest, Founder of the Pious Society of the Missions known as the Pallottini. (*S. R. C.*, Jan. 13, 1887.) *Vid. Tablet*, Feb. 5, 1887.

DEACON AND SUB-DEACON.—Should they help to vest the celebrant? Two decrees were issued, requiring the Deacon and Sub-Deacon to do so—one to the Metropolitan Neapolitan Church, the other to the Chapter of San Miniati, in both of which places the custom had been followed from time immemorial. (*S. R. C.*, April 23, 1875, and Sept. 12, 1884.) *Vid. Tablet*, March 12, 1887.

DIVISION OF PARISHES IN SOUTHERN ITALY.—For conditions required before a parish could be divided *vid. Tablet*, Feb. 5, 1887. (*S. C. C.*, March 27, 1886).

DUPLICATION allowed in the case of a Mission near Monte Casino, where one of two priests is frequently sick, but with strict limitations. (*S. Cong. Conc.*, May 29, 1886.) *Vid. Tablet*, Feb. 26, 1887.

ENGLISH MARTYRS.—A pontifical *Decretum Confirmationis Cultus* of the fifty-four English martyrs, who suffered in this country from 1535 A.D. to 1583, was issued on Dec. 29 of last year. For Decree and names of the martyrs, *vid. Tablet*, Jan. 15, 1887.

- Bridgett, Rev. T. E., The Story of the French Exiles, 140; **Souls Departed**, *noticed*, 213; The Ritual of the N.T., *noticed*, 452.
- Britten, James, The Catholic Truth Society, 400.
- British Association, Meeting of, 182.
- Bruce, E. S., War and Ballooning, 278.
- Buddha, Edwin Arnold's, 204; Opinions of, on God, the Soul, &c., 426.
- Bühler, G., The Laws of Manu, *noticed*, 483.
- Cæremoniale Episcoporum. Editio typica, *noticed*, 222.
- Caine, Hall, a Son of Hagar, *noticed*, 422.
- Canada, Asiatic trade through, 9.
- Canty, Rev. W., Purgatory, *noticed*, 214.
- Caraffa, Father V., School of Divine Love, *noticed*, 239.
- Catechism, Maynooth, *noticed*, 462.
- Catholic Directory, *noticed*, 238.
- Truth Society, 400; Precursor Societies, 401; **Activity of Laity in** 407; Origin, Objects, Prospects, and Needs of C.T.S., 408.
- Caucasus, The Gates of the, 190.
- Champagnat, Life of Father, *noticed*, 489.
- Charvériat E., Bohême religieuse en XVI Siècle, *noticed*, 455.
- Chemical Elements and Protyle, 184.
- Children, Poor, The Lost and Stolen of our, 157; **Homes and Refuges for**, 158; Proselytizing efforts among, 160; Methods and Agents, 163; **Illustrative "Cases,"** 168.
- China, Russian Influence in, 417.
- Christie, Albany J., Spiritual Exercises, *noticed*, 489.
- Chronologies, Ancient, and Man, 178.
- Church Extension and Anglican Expansion, 243; **Anglican Notions of**,—Sir G. W. Cox, 245; and Dr. Martineau, 247; **Absurdity of**, 251; **Miracles as a proof of Catholic Claim**, 256.
- after the Conquest, 306; the Conqueror's Arbitrary Action, 307; his Bishops, 312; Lanfranc and the Rights of Canterbury, 314; **Encroachments of King on Church**, 322; the Jurisdiction of the Pope, 327.
- and Empire during Reign of Gallienus, 424.
- Clement VII, Politics of, 208.
- Clementis V., Regestum, *noticed*, 231.
- Clerke, Miss E. M., the Portuguese in India, 98.
- Cloquet Abbé, Month of the Dead, *noticed*, 239.
- Colonies, French, 191.
- Consitt, Right Rev. E., Life of St. Cuthbert, *noticed*, 437.
- Corea, Trade of the, 196.
- Cornhill Magazine*, *noticed*, 460.
- Costa Rosetti, J., Philosophia Moralis, *noticed*, 226.
- Courcy, Marquis de, La Coalition de 1701, *noticed*, 235.
- Cox, Homersham, First Century of Christianity, *noticed*, 486.
- Craddock, C. E., In the Clouds, *noticed*, 421.
- Creighton, M., Papacy during the Reformation, *noticed*, 430.
- Critics and Class Lists, 287.
- Cunningham, John, Growth of Church Organizations and Institutions, *noticed*, 486.
- W., St. Austin, *noticed*, 223.
- Cuthbert, S., Lives of, *noticed*, 437.
- DAMIEN**, Father, and the Lepers, 191.
- Darwin, G., Limits of Geological Time, 185.
- Dawson, Sir W., Inaugural Address of, 182.

- De Bonald, *Pensées*, *noticed*, 454.
 Deluge, The, 208.
 De Navery, Raoul, Castle of Coëtquen, *noticed*, 470.
 Devas, C. S., Shakespeare as an Economist, 57; Notice by, 180.
 De Witt, P., Invasion Prussienne en Hollande, *noticed*, 462.
 Didron, A. N., Christian Iconography, *noticed*, 464.
 Donnelly, E. C., Memoir of Father Barbelin, S. J., *noticed*, 488.
 Doyle, James E., Official Baronage of England, *noticed*, 475.
 Duke, Rev. H. C., King, Prophet, and Priest, *noticed*, 461.
- EDICT of Nantes, The, 205.
 Egypt, 179.
 English Constitution in Theory and Practice, 45; Montesquieu on, 46; growth of, 51; America and Colonies compared with, 53.
 ——— Illustrated Magazine, *noticed*, 460.
 Evans, H. H., St. Paul and the Second Gospel, *noticed*, 472.
- FARRAR, F. W., History of Interpretation, *noticed*, 468.
 Fatalism, Influence of, on Opinion, 125; Examples of Modern Teaching on, 128; Mr. Gladstone, 130; Mr. Chamberlain, 131; Character of Fatalism, 134.
 Final Science, The, *noticed*, 462.
 Formby, Rev. H., Monotheism, *noticed*, 444.
 Formosa, Scenery of, 416.
 Francis Xavier, St., at Goa, 111.
 Fraser, D., Synoptical Lectures on Scriptures, *noticed*, 456.
 French Exiles, The Story of the, 140: total number of, 144; how received in England, 145; Protestant help, 147; Government grants to, 150; gratitude of, to England, 155.
 Future Probation, *noticed*, 484.
- GALLENDA, A., Italy Present and Future, *noticed*, 359.
 Gallienus, Empire and Church under, 424.
 Gneist, Dr. R., English Parliament, Translation, *noticed*, 233.
 Graham, John W., *Neræa*, *noticed*, 200.
 Grant, Rev. Colin C., Where St. Patrick was Born, 334.
 Guigo, Abbé, Consolation in Suffering, *noticed*, 239.
 Gurney, Edmund, Critics and Class Lists, 287.
- HAGGARD, H. Rider, She, *noticed*, 420; Jess, *noticed*, 422; Dawn, *noticed*, 424.
 Hamilton, Rev. A., Ancient and Benedictine Customs, 80.
 Harrison, Frederic, The Choice of Books, *noticed*, 470.
 ——— Joanna, A Northern Lily, *noticed*, 199.
 Hazara Country, The, 418.
 Hazell's Encyclopædia, 1887, *noticed*, 454.
 Herchenbach, W., The Coiner's Cave, *noticed*, 458.
 Hedley, Bishop, The Christian Priesthood, *noticed*, 221.
 Herbert, Lady Thekla, *noticed*, 458.
 Hergenröther, Cardinal, Kirchengeschichte, *noticed*, 448.
 Hettinger's Dante, Translation, *noticed*, 438.
 Hicks, Rev. E. L., Life of H. Bazely, *noticed*, 461.
 Hodgkins, T., Letters of Cassiodorus, *noticed*, 477.
 Hüffer's Life of St. Bernard, *noticed*, 220.
 Humphrey, Rev. W., The Bible and Unbelief, *noticed*, 219; The Spouses of the King, *noticed*, *ibid.*; Christian Marriage, *noticed*, *ibid.*
 Hurter, H., Nomenclator Literarius, *noticed*, 221.
 Hypnotism, 428.

